

7/10
602
A
R E V I E W
OF THE
MEMOIRS
OF THE
PROTECTORAL HOUSE

OF
C R O M W E L L,
BY THE

Rev. MARK NOBLE, F. A. S. of L. & E.
RECTOR OF BARMING, IN KENT. See p. 25.

ADDRESSED TO THE

Right Hon. the EARL of SANDWICH,
The PATRON of that WORK.

IN WHICH

The numerous Errors of those Memoirs are pointed out, and
great variety of interesting facts, there misrepresented,
are set in a clear and true light.

BEING

A proper, and very necessary SUPPLEMENT to that Publication.

By WILLIAM RICHARDS.

*When truth or virtue an affront endures,
The affront is mine, my friend, and should be yours.*

L Y N N;

PRINTED AND SOLD BY R. MARSHALL;

Sold also by T. CADELL, in the Strand, London; and by most
of the Bookfellers, in Town and Country.

MDCCLXXXVII.

10

SHORTLY WILL BE PUBLISHED,

M A R S H A L L ' S
CATALOGUE of BOOKS,

For the Year, 1788.

Containing many *scarce* and *valuable* Works both of *ancient* and
modern Authors. The whole of which will be *sold* at the *low*
Prices printed in the Catalogue, (for *READY MONEY only.*)

C O R R I G E N D A,

p. 17. l. 2. for *Ode* read *Poem*.

p. 22. l. 8. after *say*, a comma.

p. 27. l. 1. after *edit.* read *1st.*

p. 32. l. 14. for *discretion*, read *discretion*,

p. 40. for *priveleges*, read *privileges*.

p. 41. l. 10. after *least*, a comma.

p. 41. Note, after pp. read 7 & 8.

p. 47. l. 1. for *Nonconformists*, read *Non-*
conformists.



(4)

R E V I E W, &c.

My LORD,

AS you have condescended to honour the *Memoirs of the Protectoral House of Cromwell* with your Patronage, it is presumed that a Review of that Publication cannot be addressed to any one with more propriety than to your Lordship.

When it is considered how greatly the *second* Edition of the *Memoirs* is indebted to your Lordship's exertions*, it is not to be expected that the reputation of it should be to you a matter of perfect indif-

A 2

ference

* In the *Dedication*, the Author dignifies the assistance he had received from the *Earl of Sandwich*, by the appellation of *unparalleled condescension*; and in the *Preface* p. viii. his Lordship's name stands foremost in the catalogue of friends and benefactors, who had contributed to the improvement of the work. The Earl's munificence and condescension in promoting this edition, will ever (he says) reflect an honour upon the Author and the Volumes, they could never otherwise have experienced; the Author declines saying more, as no words can convey to the reader the obligations he owes, or the gratitude he feels."

Super 69.

ference. On that account, and as the Author's Friend and Patron, your Lordship may probably wish, that the errors and blemishes of that performance might pass unnoticed, or at least, unexposed. But in my view of things, that would be carrying the matter somewhat too far; as it would be shewing a greater regard for friendship, and other inferior considerations, than for justice and truth. It can be no dishonour to an Author to have his work examined, and his mistakes exposed. And if he be properly influenced by the love of truth, and a sense of his own fallibility, he will not feel himself hurt, or degraded, by such a treatment.

The *first* Edition of the Memoirs, my Lord, is a work that abounds with errors, more, perhaps, than any other modern production. In the *second* Edition, some of those errors are corrected, and the work, it must be said, is considerably improved. But still, its errors and blemishes are neither few nor small. I think it would have been but *justice*, to have supplied the purchasers of the *first* Edition, with a kind of *supplement* to it, when the second Edition made its appearance. That supplement should have contained a list of the errors which had been discovered in the first, with the most material additions and improvements, which had been made in the second edition. The author must have known that this had been often done in similar cases: And it certainly would have been to his credit, to have done so too. Indeed one cannot help thinking it somewhat strange, that neither he, nor his noble patron, nor yet any one of his numerous coadjutors, should have seen the propriety, and necessity, of adopting such a measure. But as nothing of the kind has been thought of, I shall take the liberty of marking, as I go along, some of the blemishes of the first, as well

as those of the second edition, with a view of making my strictures the more extensively useful.

Our Author, you know, my Lord, is exceedingly severe upon the *Genealogy of the Cromwells*, lately published by Mr. Gough, in the *Bibliotheca Topographica Britannica*, No. XXXI. That work, according to him, is very defective indeed. How well founded the charge may be, I cannot take upon me to decide, as I have not had the pleasure of seeing that publication. If what he has alledged against it be true, it must be very extraordinary that a writer of Mr. Gough's reputation, should suffer such a worthless performance to see the light. Among other defects, Mr. Noble charges the *Genealogy* with being extremely erroneous and contradictory; equally false in its dates, and the statement of facts; and abounding in misnomers. Really, my Lord, this is exceedingly curious; for these very blemishes belong to his own performance; and the self same charge may be brought against that work, with the strictest propriety.

Without saying any more by way of preliminary; or apology, I shall now, my Lord, proceed to state, as briefly as I can, the principal things in your friend's publication, which appear to me objectionable.

Those who are competent judges, my Lord, will, I doubt not, very readily acknowledge, that the *Style* of the *Memoirs*, as far as Mr. Noble is concerned with it, has no sort of claim to praise. It is never elegant,—feldom easy and correct,—sometimes, in no small degree, affected and pedantic,—often obscure, uncouth, barbarous, and ungrammatical.

In Vol. i. preface, p. iv. a certain circumstance is mentioned, as not in the least tending to CONVE-

NIENCE

NIENCE *the reader*. This curious expression, called to my mind the memorable phraseology of a certain reputable tradesman, of singular complaisance, and very pompous manners, who used incessantly to profess, his unfeigned, ardent, and invincible wishes TO PLEASURE *his customers*.

In page 3. of the same volume, we are very gravely told, that "the history of men who lived in barbarous ages, and a still more savage country, could give no pleasure; and but little knowledge." Those writers, then, must have laboured in vain, who have written the history of barbarous ages, and of savage nations. But let us attend, my Lord, a little more particularly to the former part of this quotation.—"Men who lived in barbarous ages, and a still more savage country." Still *more* savage than what? One is apt to imagine, in reading these words, that the author had been speaking, just before of something of a *very savage* nature, in comparison with which, *Wales* is pronounced, a *still more savage* country. That however, is not the case; and as it is not, I think we can say no less than, that he has here expressed himself in a very stupid, and a very senseless manner. When I first read the above passage, I could not help saying to myself, this writer, surely, must have judged it necessary, to speak of barbarous ages, and of savage nations, in a *barbarous and savage Style*.

But what disgusts me most, my Lord, in the passage in question, is the unmanly, acrimonious and lying spirit it discovers. A spirit which, indeed, is but too frequently manifested by English writers, when they happen to have any occasion to speak of the Principality. Some of these, I must confess, have expressed themselves upon the subject, much more openly, and pointedly, as well as much
more

more elegantly, than Mr. Noble has here done. But if they have exceeded him in propriety of expression, and the decorations of language, they cannot be said to have done so, in the degree, or extent of their prejudice. There he is certainly entitled to the foremost place; of which his words now under consideration afford one good proof. His meaning in those words, my Lord, appears to be, if I may be allowed to explain it, "That Wales, during the period he refers to, which is that from the æra of the Norman conquest to the Reformation, was a country so very savage, as to be unparalleled even in the barbarous ages." This doctrine, my Lord, readily as it may be received on this side the Severn, is nevertheless, totally destitute of truth; and must undoubtedly, be either the offspring of extreme illiberality, or bare-faced ignorance.

Had he subjected only his own country to the comparison, and told us, that Wales, at any one period, prior to the Reformation, was a *more* barbarous and savage country than England, I should, even then, have taken upon me to dispute the assertion.

From the foundation of the Heptarchy, to the memorable reign of Alfred, England, my Lord, was certainly in a less civilized state than Wales. And if the former made a vast progress in civilization, in the course of that reign, which nobody will attempt to deny, still it seems but fair and just, to allow the latter a considerable share of the merit of it. Some of the principal persons to whom the immortal Alfred was indebted for his own learning, and who assisted him to instruct and civilize his subjects, were, certainly, natives of the principality. That Country, my Lord, had its schools and colleges, when nothing of the kind was known in England.

And

And even at the time when Alfred ascended the throne of his ancestors, learning appears to have flourished in Wales, as much as it did any where in the Western World. That excellent Prince was too good and wise, not to avail himself of that circumstance. He was very far from deeming it beneath him, to employ the enlightened natives of that country, in dispelling the ignorance and barbarity, that had long covered and debased his own dominions. He found them well qualified to promote his great and patriotic projects, and he readily employed them. Nor was the confidence he had reposed in them abused. They laboured in his service with fidelity and zeal; and it must be said, that their labours were not in vain. One of them, the celebrated *Affer*, was the King's bosom friend and chief counsellor: And we need not seek for any further proof of his transcendent merit.* Of the same country, according to *Bale* and *Pits*, was the famous *Johannes Scotus Erigena*, reputed the greatest scholar of his time, and who was also patronized by Alfred, and retained at his court. It must, surely, be rather improbable, that the most barbarous and savage of all countries, should have produced such men as these.

In

*“ Let England in her *Alfred's* high renown,
Boast of a Monarch worthy of her Crown;
But let not Cambrian Science be forgot,
How *Affer* taught, how Alfred learning got.
Monsters Ingrate! how can you barbarous † call,
The men who taught the brightest of you all?
The false historians of a polish'd age,
Shew that the Saxon has not lost his rage;
Though tam'd by arts, his rancor yet remains;
Beware of Saxons still, ye Cambrian Swains.”

† A favourite Epithet used by Lord Lyttleton, who has remarkably verified the British Proverb, “*Calon y Sais at y Cymro.*”

Evans's Love of our Country, p. 15. &c.

In viewing the time that elapsed between the death of Alfred and the conquest, nothing will occur to warrant a supposition, that Wales was then a more savage country than England. And should we proceed to examine the times subsequent to the æra of the conquest, down to the reign of the *first* Edward, we shall find no room to imagine, but that the Principality, even then, kept pace with England, in point of civilization and literature.

The names of near *forty* persons, who flourished during that interval, are still preserved among the the Welsh, as men of that nation, who were eminent in their day, for their parts and learning. Some of them were celebrated for their skill in the healing art; others for their historical labours; and the rest for their poetical talents and productions. A good part of their works is still extant. Their poetical remains, especially, are frequently referred to, and quoted, by the very learned Dr. *Davies*, and Mr. *Richards*, in their Dictionaries, as their authorities, in establishing the sense of British words. In short, my Lord, it may be very truly said of these men, that they were all possessed of a large portion of useful knowledge, highly calculated to promote social order and good morals, with a disposition and ability to communicate and diffuse the same. Hence an inference may be safely drawn in favour of the manners of the people at that period,—at least, as *not* being of a *more* savage complexion than those of their neighbours.

The period which next demands our attention, is that from the accession of *Edward the first*, or rather, from the reduction of Wales by him, to the reformation. A period which those who take upon them to defame that country, never fail to remind us of, whenever they are called upon to make good their allegations

allegations. These men, however, ought to remember, that Wales was then subject to England. And we must beg leave to tell them, that if, in the mean time, it really merited the name of a *savage country*, England is entitled to a very large share of the infamy of it. Not only, it cannot be said that the English, within that period, ever adopted any measures for the purpose of enlightening and civilizing the Welsh, but it may, on the contrary, be very safely affirmed, that they did really adopt, almost every measure that could, in any degree conduce, to render them completely barbarous and savage, as well as completely miserable. While others extol the *English Justinian*, and speak of his character in the sublimest strains of panegyric, the Welsh have every reason upon earth to detest and execrate his memory. They derived from him innumerable evils, and not a single advantage of any consequence, to counterbalance them.

The *Laws for Wales*, enacted within this period, are strongly marked with injustice, of the most savage kind. Scarce any thing equal to them is to be found in all the black annals of malevolence and tyranny. By those laws, my Lord, the Welsh were not allowed to purchase any land,—to be elected Members of Parliament,—to undertake any office, civil or military, in a corporate town,—to bear arms,—to give their children a learned education, or bind them apprentices to any trade or occupation, in any city, or town corporate,—to hold any kind of assembly, except in the presence of English officers: And if any of them happened to have a suit at Law, with one of their oppressors, the latter could not be convicted, but before an English judge, and by the verdict of a Jury of Englishmen, &c. &c.

These, my Lord, were not laws made merely for
the

the purpose of being held up *in terrorem*. The legislators who enacted them, meant no less than, that they should be strictly observed, and rigorously executed: And the officers whom they stationed in that country, took special care, that they should not therein be disappointed. The character of those officers, for rapaciousness, and all manner of outrage, exceeded all example: and the complaints of the people were louder against the ministers of the law, than against the law itself, execrable and intolerable as that was.

It ought not to be forgotten, my Lord, that the system of tyranny, exhibited then in Wales, was founded upon certain transactions, that were but too well calculated to give it effect and permanence: although they did no manner of credit to the justice, the humanity, or the politeness of the people who were the authors of them.

Among those transactions, we must reckon the destruction of religious houses, and other public edifices, all over the Principality; the burning of the books, and records of the country; the massacre of the Bards; and finally, the captivity of such of the Chiefs, and others, as were most eminent for their literature and patriotism.

Those illustrious, but unfortunate captives, were confined in the Tower of London. Thither they carried along with them, most of the books and records of their country, that had escaped the rapacious and savage hands of the English. This was done with a view to furnish themselves with such an employment in prison, as might alleviate their sufferings, and render captivity itself somewhat tolerable. But the expedient, instead of answering their expectations, became, on the contrary, a source of additional distress: For the men, into whose hands they had fallen

(and

(and who can say, that they were not men of the most gentle and polished manners?) ordered their books and records, to be committed to the flames. Thus perished the remains of ancient British literature; and thus, my Lord, did English benevolence and urbanity, display themselves at that time of day!

My Lord, I wish those Englishmen who take upon them to decry Wales, had condescended to acquaint themselves, a little more fully, with the state of their own country, at this same period. In that case, their strictures on the Principality, would not, perhaps, have been quite so severe as they now are. The character of the English was then very far from being amiable. The spirit of the nation was fierce and cruel to the last degree; and excited the people to engage in the most unnatural and violent contests; which, as a certain historian observes, hardened their hearts, inflamed their passions, and made them familiar with blood and slaughter. Their wars, at this period, were uncommonly brutal and sanguinary: Prisoners of distinction were generally put to death on the field, in cold blood: Assassinations and murders were very frequent; perpetrated on persons of the greatest eminence, by the hands of kings, nobles, and near relations.

Nor was the shocking ferocity of that time, peculiar to the *men*: The *women* appear to have been equally infected by it. It was then, my Lord, no uncommon thing to see *English Ladies* and *Gentlewomen* abandon their domestic concerns, together with all the gentleness, and delicacy of their sex, for the sake of taking up, and following the trade of war.

At this period, England was also grievously infested with *robbers*, beyond all other European countries: which is no proof of its superior state of civilization. It was likewise distinguished as the favourite seat of
irrational

irrational credulity, and the most stupid *superstition*. Hence it soon became noted, as the very best of all markets for Romish commodities.

The *profane conversation* of the people of England, my Lord, was also at that time, notorious to a proverb: infomuch, that *Englishmen* and *God-dam-mees*, passed among their neighbours as *synonymous terms*. Kings and courtiers were addicted to this horrid vice, equally with those in humbler stations. It was remarked, indeed, as a striking peculiarity in the character of Henry VI. that he not only refrained from swearing in common conversation, but even reproved his ministers and officers of state, for that practice. But that very circumstance, plainly indicates, that the same could not be said of any of the other English Princes of those times. Nor is it at all improbable, that Henry's temperance and sobriety, might contribute in no small degree, to alienate the affections of his Subjects, and in the issue, to deprive him of his crown, and of his life.

Your Lordship, I trust, will permit me to add, that the English of that period were in truth a most unprincipled and faithless people. Not only common *Lying*, was then a fashionable practice in England, so that men made no manner of conscience of their words and declarations; but even the most solemn and tremendous *Oaths*, were violated with impunity, and without the least hesitation or remorse. This was the case, my Lord, with those in the most elevated stations; Princes, peers, and prelates, not excepted. It is therefore no wonder, as the fore-mentioned historian has remarked, that the *common people* were so profligate in this respect, that not a few of them *lived by swearing for hire in courts of Justice*.*

B 3

From

* See Henry's History of England. Vol. V.

From these facts, my Lord, it may be very fairly urged, that an Englishman cannot with any degree of good grace, or even decency, reproach the Welsh of that period for their savageness; seeing his own ancestors are, at least, equally exposed to the same imputation, and had moreover, largely contributed (as was before hinted) towards every thing of the kind, that then existed in Wales. The seed which produced the savageness and miseries, which sprung up then, in that country, had been conveyed thither from England, and sown there by the hands of Englishmen.

But in spite of all that the Welsh did suffer from English tyranny, during the gloomy period under consideration, their spirit remained unbroken, and their light unextinguished. Wales even then, my Lord, could boast of some names, that would have done honour to any country, and to any age. And, if it did not produce a *Wickliff*, a *Chaucer*, and a *Roger Bacon*, it may yet be said, that it did produce a *Walter Brute*,† a *Gower*, and a *Sir John Oldcastle*. Surely it would hardly have produced such men as these, had it been in the mean time, so entirely involved, in darkness and barbarity, as is commonly represented by English writers. The truth is, knowledge was all this while, cultivated in Wales, by a numerous race of Bards, that had sprung up out of the ashes of those whom Edward

I. had

† *Walter Brute* was an eminent Welsh Reformer, in the reign of Richard II. He was a Layman; but a Person of great piety, benevolence, and learning; and an extraordinary instrument of spreading religious knowledge among his Countrymen, and of reforming the nation. Richard and his clergy, did as much thirst for his blood, as Harry V. and his clergy, did some years after, for that of his countryman Lord Cobham.—See Fox's Acts, and Mon.—Also Memoirs of Monmouthshire.

I. had massacred. The names of *upwards of an hundred and forty* of these, have escaped the wreck of ages, and reached our time. Their works sufficiently prove that they were persons of considerable abilities, and that their country must have been greatly benefited by their labours.

The *Welsh Bards*, my Lord, as well as the Welsh nation at large, have been usually treated with great injustice, and indignity, by their neighbours. They have been held up frequently, in so unfavourable a point of view, that a stranger would naturally imagine them to have been altogether as profligate, insignificant, and useless an order of men, as even our modern race of Mountebanks, and strolling Players. But they were certainly very far from deserving this treatment. In truth, my Lord, the Welsh Bards, merited a very high degree of respect from their cotemporaries, and from posterity. The laws of their profession required, under very severe penalties, that their lives should be irreproachable, and exemplary. Nor were any admitted into the order, but persons of approved virtue, genius, and learning. Their election, before the subjugation of their country, was conducted in the most serious and solemn manner, in an assembly of the first men of the land, where the *Prince* himself presided. And they were chosen for the purpose of cultivating good morals, hospitable manners, and patriotism: And of course, to promote *civilization*. The law which was made by one of the best of the Welsh Princes*, to secure them from contempt and insult, and which remained long in force in that country, is a proof that their character was unimpeachable, as well as that

* Howel Dhâ.—Mr. Noble calls him Prince of *North Wales*, Vol 2. p, 111. But all who are acquainted with the history of that country, know that he was Prince of *all Wales*.

that their superiors were fully satisfied with their conduct, and considered them as a very useful and respectable body. In short, it is very certain, that the Bards who lived in the ages prior to the reduction of Wales, were great benefactors to their country, and formed a very strong barrier against the encroachments of profligacy, barbarism, and ignorance. And the very same, my Lord, may be said of the later Bards, although they were not favoured, like their predecessors, with the patronage of Government. But it was the English government that they lived under; which could not, perhaps, be expected to patronize an institution, not of English origin; and which had the benefit of Wales, and only that, for its object.

Another circumstance, my Lord, which ought not here to pass unnoticed, is, that Wales, at the period in question, was not entirely destitute of the light of the sacred writings; and even, that it had those writings then in its own language. This may be concluded from the scriptural complexion of the productions of the Bards of that time; and from the testimony of Doctor Richard Davies, one of the most eminent of the Welsh Bishops of the sixteenth century; who in his epistle prefixed to the Welsh New Testament, printed in 1567, declares that he well remembered having seen, when a lad, the five books of Moses, in Welsh, at the house of a near relation of his. This relation is supposed to have been *Gryffudd ap Ievan ap Llewelyn Fychan*, a noted Bard, who flourished about the year 1500. But, my Lord, it is not to be supposed, that the Pentateuch was the only part of the Bible that was then in Welsh. There is, I think, very good reason to believe, that, at least, the New Testament also had been translated into the same language. Many
of

of the works of the Bards of that time, indicate as much: Among others, a *Cywydd*, or kind of Ode, composed by the Bard just mentioned, exhibits very ample evidence, that the Author was well acquainted with that book. He there mentions a number of facts, that are recorded in the New Testament, and quotes one passage out of it, in such a manner, as would induce one to conclude, that he had the very book before him, in his mother tongue.

The cultivated state of the Welsh tongue, at the very close of the period we are now reviewing, is another circumstance, my Lord, that ought to be here recorded; as it appears quite incompatible with the supposition, that the country had been then, for the space of two hundred years, entirely overgrown with the most savage barbarity. At the reformation, my Lord, the Welsh was really a correct and polished language. Dr. Johnson, seemed to be very sensible of this, when he gave that language the character of *cultivated*, and observed that the Welsh, two hundred years ago, insulted their English neighbours, for the instability of their orthography.*

Of all barbarous and savage countries, the languages, I apprehend, have been always found barbarous and savage likewise. But this, my Lord, cannot be said of the Welsh, at the reformation. Its version of the Bible, must be a cogent proof, that it was then capable of expressing the meaning, or ideas, of that sacred book, with as much clearness, propriety, fulness and sublimity, as any language in Europe. Surely, from this undoubted character of the language, a fair conclusion may be drawn in favour of the state of the country—It was evidently the language of a civilized people—A people of an enlightened understanding, of a refined taste, and of polished manners.

As

* Journey to the Western Islands.

As to the state of Wales, *since the Reformation*, I think it may be very safely affirmed, that it has been as far from deserving the name of *barbarous* or *savage*, as most parts of the British dominions. And at this present time, I am certain that its inhabitants are a more intelligent and civilized, as well as a more hospitable and virtuous people, than those of many parts of England that I could mention.

Before I quit this topic, I cannot help taking some notice of the late strictures of the *English Reviewers* upon *Warrington's History of Wales*. Those doughty critics, in the true spirit of their nation, have taken upon them to assert, "That the Welsh, have not as yet, since their incorporation with England, brought forth *any* fruit, worthy of the tree, into which they have been ingrafted;" and also, "that Wales has never produced many men, distinguished either by arts, or arms." They have, however, with peculiar condescension allowed, that "*a Lord Herbert of Chisbury*, might be an exception, in former times, as a *Price*, is in the present, to this general observation."* Must poor Lord Herbert then, stand alone for former times, without so much as one of his countrymen to bear him company! Surely, with, or without the leave of these very knowing Gentlemen, we may venture to join with him, his good brother *George*; a person whose parts were held in the highest estimation, by some of the very best judges, among his cotemporaries. Even the great *Lord Bacon*, is known to have been his intimate and cordial friend; and is said to have entertained so high an opinion of his judgment, that he would not suffer his own works to be printed, till

they

* English Review, Vol. 7. pp 331. 342.

had passed his examination.* And should we find it necessary to form a *triumvirate* of eminent Welshmen, for former times, I think, my Lord, we should not be guilty either of presumption, or of impertinence, were we to add to these two, the celebrated name of *Inigo Jones*.†

Large additions, my Lord, might be easily made to these names, from Cambria's eminent sons of former times; and the name of *Tyndal*, the Reformer,‡ would perhaps deserve the very first place: but enough has been done already to shew, that it cannot be said with any degree, or the least shadow of truth, that Lord Herbert, was the *only* person of distinguished parts, who then sprung up in that country.

Nor is it more true, that *Dr. Price*, is the only eminent Welshman, that the present age has produced. The present age has also produced a *Pennant*, a *Dyer*, a *Tucker*, a *Rees*, a *Kenyon*, and a *David Williams*: all of whom, I presume, will be considered by all good judges, as men of very eminent parts; and such sort of fruit (to adopt our Reviewer's metaphor,) as can be no way disgraceful to the tree into which their nation has been ingrafted. To these may be added a *William Jones*, the late Vice-president of the Royal Society, and one of the greatest Mathematicians of his time. He was the father of the present *Sir William Jones*, confessedly, one of the greatest Scholars, and one of the most extraordinary and respectable characters of the present day.

C

Here

* See *Encyclopedia Britannica* Art. Herbert (George)

† See Hon. Daines Barrington's *Introduction to the History of the Gwedir Family*.

‡ See Lewis's *History of the several translations of the Bible*. p. 72. Also *Epitome of Eccl. Hist.* p. 138.

Here likewise, my Lord, I could make very considerable additions, were it any wise necessary; but I have done quite enough to answer my purpose.

Indeed were I obliged to mention any more names, I believe I should begin with that of Mr. *William Edwards*, of Glamorganshire; a person highly, and justly respected by his Countrymen, as an architect; and who deserves to be placed, as such, in the very first rank among his contemporaries; of which he has given many, and demonstrative proofs. The chief monument of his superior genius and skill in that line, is the famous *bridge of Ty Pridd*, built over the *Tawe*, some miles above Caerdiff, on one of the most romantic spots that one of the most romantic countries can boast of. It consists of *one Arch*, which for lightness, and the width of its span, is said to stand unrivalled, not only by any bridge in England, but even in Europe, and perhaps in the whole world; exceeding the *Ryalto* at Venice, by 50 feet, and the centre of *Blackfriars*, by 40 feet. This arch is the segment of a circle; the chord is 140 feet; the Key-stone, from the spring of the arch is 34 feet high. Those words of *Pope*, in his Epitaph on Sir Godfrey Kneller, "By heaven and not a master taught," could not be more applicable to that great man, than they are to the eminent Architect who designed and executed this noble work of art.*

Now

* The following may serve as a short sketch of the history of the bridge above described. Some time about the commencement of the present reign, (the exact time I cannot recollect,) Mr. Edwards contracted with the county for a certain sum of money to build them a bridge which should stand at least six Years; and accordingly built one of three arches; but a flood happening, which is no uncommon event, in that mountainous country, it was carried away by the impetuosity of the river. He next conceived the design of constructing a bridge of *one single arch*, and accordingly

Now, my Lord, I shall take my leave of these *English* Critics, well knowing that to contend with them, or call their infallibility in question, is in vain. For were I able to produce a *thousand* modern Welsh names, all of equal celebrity with a *Pennant*, a *Price*, or a *Sir William Jones*, their High Mightinesses, I know, would still maintain their favourite position, "That it is certainly fact, that the Welsh have not as yet, since their incorporation with England, brought forth any fruit worthy of the tree into which they have been ingrafted!"

I would here, however, beg your Lordship's permission just to remind these Gentlemen, and Noble too, that their good neighbours the *Yr Welsh* have often exhibited the *English* in as unfavourable a light, as they, and others of their countrymen, ever have done, or possibly can do the *Welsh*. According to their accounts, my Lord, the *English* is a nation of *faithless barbarians*,—the vilest of all vile nations—a community of greedy dogs, wolves, and bears. In short, every savage and detestable term, has been by them applied to the people of England. And if the point were to be decided by a majority of votes, their verdict, I am afraid, would be too sure

of accordingly compleated it; but here he was again foiled; for the pressure of the abutment not being in equilibrio with that of the crown of the arch, squeezed it out at top. Not disheartened at this, he set about contriving how the fault might be avoided, and hit upon the present method, by making three cylindrical apertures through each side, thereby not only considerably lessening the weight of lateral pressure, but adding greatly at the same time, to the picturesque form and elegance of the bridge, which bids fair to transmit his fame, to future generations. —Mr. Edwards is, and has been for many years, the very worthy pastor of a Dissenting Congregation in the same neighbourhood, and not a Methodist preacher, as some have reported. See *Monthly Review* Vol. 61. p. 11. Also *Tour through Great Brit.* last edit. Vol. 2. p. 304.

of being established: for it is more than probable, they might obtain the suffrages, not only of the united states of America, the Irish, the poor natives of Indostan, and of Africa, but even of almost every other nation, that has had any dealings, of late years, with the English.

If any apology should be demanded for having dwelt so long upon this topic, I can only say. *It was a tribute I owed to truth, to humanity, and to my Country.*

But to return to the *Memoirs*, our author speaking of Oliver, vol. i. p. 134. 1st. edit. says, "It is probable that he never was at court, *nor never* in any but *a few days Parliament.*" Surely, my Lord, one might expect, that a F. S. A. would have expressed himself in a somewhat different manner. But possibly, as he had heard the parliament which met in 1640, called *the long parliament*, and another, or rather the same, some years after, called, *the rump parliament*, and another again, *Barebone's parliament*, and *the little parliament*, he had a mind to call that which met in 1628, and of which Oliver was a member, *the few days parliament*. Be this as it may, I never heard it called so before: *nor never* (to borrow your friend's mode of expression) expect to hear it called so again.

In the same vol. p. 40. speaking of the pleasure with which the English received king James I. our author says—"all strove to please, every one to see the new Sovereign." To my ear, my Lord, this conveys a very strange and awkward sound; and I doubt not, but your Lordship will acknowledge, that, *all strove to see, and to please the new sovereign*, would have sounded much better.

In p. 228.* we are told, that *it was supposed*, that Serjeant

* 1st. Edit.

Serjeant Pengelly *was supposed* to be a natural son of his employer," [Richard Cromwell.] And that supposition, it seems, was *partly* founded upon the Serjeant's uncommon zeal for the quondam Protector, at a certain trial:—as if a counsel's warm exertions for his client, were any reason for supposing him to be that client's *bastard*!

In p. 418. after mentioning Pride's dislike to Oliver's taking the title of King, our author tells us, that he even dared to get a petition signed by the officers of the army, *to effectually prevent it.*—This mode of expression occurs pretty frequently; for in p. 421. we read, that Oliver, *to still further bind* him, [Hewson] to his interest, knighted him.—And in vol. 2. p. 123. we are told that the army grantees were fearful that he [Hammond] might be tempted *to at least connive* at the King's flight. Also p. 145. Whalley and Monk are said to have greatly contributed *to completely defeat* the Scotch army at Dunbar. In p. 170. likewise we read that the Swedish Ambassador was going *to abruptly leave the Kingdom.* And in p. 250. Lockhart is represented as telling Cardinal Mazarine, that he should be obliged *to religiously obey the injunctions of his master.* We also read in p. 359. of the parliament's perceiving that it was Fleetwood's aim, *to again subject the nations to the rule of the army.*

In vol. 1. p. 50. our author mentions a Thomas Cromwell, of whom he says, it was either *him*, or his first cousin of his name, who was seated at great Stoughton, and fined for his delinquency.—If *him*, probably he had also served in the royal army, &c. In p. 134. speaking of Oliver's son of the same name, our author says "it was *him*, who was killed &c."

In p. 146. speaking of Oliver's death, and Richard's

ard's disgrace, our author adds, *both* of which *was* severely felt by her, i. e. Lady Fauconberg. In p. 317* we read of *the window of a great Bow window*, which our Antiquary discovered in some part of Hinchinbrook House, and which without doubt, must be a very capital curiosity—such a one, in all probability, as was never heard of before.

In vol. 2. p. 7.† the fate of Thomas Cromwell, Earl of Essex, is said to have been incurred, by obtaining a Princess for his Sovereign, who was every way undeserving of her, and *spiritingly* resenting an affront put upon him by the Duke of Norfolk." Any writer except Mr. Noble, would rather have said,—“by obtaining for his Sovereign a princess, of whom he was every way undeserving, and *warmly* resenting an affront,” &c.

In p. 274‡ speaking of *Colonel Jones*, our author expresses himself thus,—“At the gallows he vindicated himself from intending murder, in the part he acted in the King's trial and execution; and consequently that that monarch was legally put to death, which was impossible.” And in page 277. after mentioning *Humphry Jones* of London, he adds, “to whose care, Colonel John Jones assigned the care of his Letters.” But I will not enlarge on this head, as I cannot but think that I have already given a sufficient specimen of the curiosities this work contains in the department of phraseology and style.

When I read that passage, (vol. 2. p. 215.) where our author so very magisterially tells us, that “*poor Patients exposed himself*, before Jones and the council, at Christ Church, Dublin, every Sunday,” I could not help thinking that his readers might very properly rejoin.—“And so do you, Sir, before all the world, in your Memoirs, every day of the week!

Richd. Jones's death and burial. If
 * 1st, edit. † same edit. ‡ same vol. and edit.

If poor *Patients*, as you say, had formerly followed the trade of a *stocking footer*, that was surely some excuse for *his* blunders; but as for you, Sir, you have had a liberal education—you belong to that learned and venerable body, which you call the *regular clergy*—and you are, moreover, a *Fellow of the Antiquarian Societies of London and Edinburgh*, therefore *your* blunders are far less excusable, and much more scandalous.”—After all, my Lord, I will venture to affirm, that *Thomas Patient* (for that was his name) was very far from deserving the indignity which your friend has offered to his memory.

In p. 218. we are very obligingly instructed in the science of Jurisprudence, and the principles of the English Constitution. A parlement (we are told) must consist of the Sovereign, the peers, and the house of commons—The parlement did not, nor could condemn king Charles, as the two first branches did not then act; &c. &c. Charles of course, my Lord, could not be condemned by the *parliament*--because, among other reasons, he did not approve of, or concur in the sentence that was passed upon him. Moreover, as his Majesty did not consent to that sentence, and sign the warrant for his own execution, his death, forsooth, could be no less than *murder*. “*It was MURDER too* (our author tells us) *because our laws exculpate MAJESTY from punishment, and even declare IT CANNOT DO WRONG.*” James I. then, did *no wrong*, when he ordered the man, who is mentioned by some of our historians, to be *hanged without a trial*: nor would he have done any manner of *wrong*, had he ordered all those people to be hanged, or put to the sword, who offended him so grievously, by crowding to see their new sovereign, as he was passing towards London, in his first journey to that capital. My Lord, this famous maxim in our law—“The King can do no wrong:” is certainly a very convenient one for

a tyrant, and has, I believe, been in no small degree serviceable to the cause of oppression in this country. It is, however, as commonly understood and applied, by such men as Mr. Noble, at least a very ridiculous maxim. Like the doctrine of *virtual representation*, so warmly affirmed by some politicians, it has stupidity and absurdity marked on its very forehead.

I will now proceed to give your Lordship a somewhat more general view of the errors that are to be found in the Memoirs: and shall begin, by laying before you a small sample of those that are of a literal or orthographical nature. In the course of this work we meet with *Gwaithzoed*, (otherwise *Gwaith-Voyd*,) *Grogreston* spelt also *Gwireston*, and *Gwivestan*,) *Radyvore*, *Gwente*, *Vauban*, *Llowaith*, *Gronvey*, *Rhyne*, *Wenllyan*, *Llyne*, *Llandaffe*, *Sisselt*, and *Jesselin*.—All these are what the author calls *misnomers*: the right names are *Gwaithfoed*, *Gwerystan*, *Cadifor*, *Gwent*, *Vaughan*, or *Fychan*, *Llywarch*, *Gronwy*, *Rhun*, *Gwenllyan*, *Llyn*, *Llandâf*, *Syffyllt*, and *Jestyn*. *Jeban* also, and *Ywan*, are to be classed under the denomination of wrong names; they should have been written *Jevan* or *Jefan*. *Jeban* is a name unknown in Wales, but *Jevan* or *Jefan* is very common there. It is the old Welsh name for *John*; and is the same with that which is usually now-a-days spelt *Evan*; from which comes the very common Welsh surname *Evans*. *Remysb* and *Remys*, are also to be placed among the errata: The right spelling is *Cemmaes*, though more commonly spelt *Kemeys*.—It is the name of a certain district in the principality, from whence is derived the name of the ancient family of *Cefn Mabli*, or as our author calls it, *Keven Mabley*, in Glamorganshire, ancestors on the maternal side to the late *Sir Charles Kemeys Tynte*, bart. of Somersetshire. In this list of misnomers, we may also place *Williams ap Yeban*, which occurs twice in p. 312.

vol.

vol. 1. edit.* it should have been *Wiliam*, or *Gwilim ap Ievan*. Williams is used *only as a Surname* in Wales.

In vol. 1. p. 3. we meet with *Cavedig* and *Cavedigion*, which should have been *Caredig*, and *Caredigion*, or rather *Ceredig*, and *Ceredigion*—that being the more common and approved spelling.

In the same vol, p. 4. a certain parish near Caermarthen, is called *Llan Newidel*, whose proper name is *Llan Newydd*. Here I would beg leave to declare, in corroboration of *Mr. Bevan's* testimony, that there is certainly a tradition in that neighbourhood, that Cromwell's ancestors once resided there.

In some of the following inaccuracies and mistakes, the author's carelessness and stupidity will be easily discerned by your Lordship.—Richard Cromwell's maternal grandfather is in vol. 1. p. 151. (1st. ed.) called *Sir James Bourchier*, which I suppose is right: In p. 203. however, he is called *Mr. John Bourchier*. In p. 244.† *Oliver* the son of the Protector Richard, is said not to have been of age by about *three years* when his mother died: but by comparing the date of his birth in this page, with that of his mother's death in the preceding page, it appears that he was then under age *only two years, six months and six days*. In p. 246. we are told that the same gentleman died in 1705, aged *sixty-one*. In that case, he must have been born in 1644, no less than five years before the time when it is said his parents were married. We are told, however, in p. 244. and afterwards in p. 477. that he was born on the 11th. of July 1656: and in p. 479. we are again informed, that he died 1705. in the *forty ninth* year of his age.

In p. 198† *Mr. Rich*, first husband of *Lady Frances*

D

*p. 241. last edit.

†p. 189. last edit.

†1st. edit.

ees Cromwell, is said to have died after having been married *only two months*; and yet it appears, by comparing the date of his marriage with that of his death, in the very same page, that he had been married *above three months*.

In p. 199. (last edit.) we read of a person whom Ludlow in one place calls *Molson*, and in another, *Moffon*: the latter, our author says, was certainly his name, because Henry Cromwell calls him so, in a letter to Secretary Thurloe, where he is called *Colonel Roger Moffon, of Mossion in Denbighshire*. But Ludlow and Henry, and our Author too, were here, I dare say, all mistaken. *Mostyn*, I am very sure, was his name, and the name of the place of his abode; but that place is in *Flintshire*, and not in Denbighshire, as was said in Henry's letter. *Colonel Roger Mostyn*, as your Lordship probably knows, was knighted by king Charles I. for whom he was a very great sufferer. Charles II. as some compensation, I suppose, for those sufferings, created him a baronet, august 3, 1660.—The present Sir Roger Mostyn, of Mostyn, baronet, is descended from him.

In p. 389. *Monk* is said to have been a main instrument in *preventing* Charles the second's return without any conditions.

In p. 313. (1st. edit.) a certain bishop of Gloucester is called (I suppose rightly) Dr. Goodman; but he is afterwards *thrice* in the very same page, called Dr. Goodwin. In the same edition vol. 2. p. 7. the famous protestant prelate, commonly called archbishop Cranmer, is repeatedly called archbishop Cranmore. And in p. 218. Sir Oliver Cromwell, the protector's *uncle* is called his *grandfather*. In the last edition vol. 2. p. 54. Sir Francis Masham is said to have died in 1702-3 after having buried *both his wives*; and yet we are told presently after, that

that his 2d. wife died in 1708. In p. 433. Sir *Charles* Henry Frankland, is called Sir *Thomas*; and in the note, he is called Sir Charles Henry *Fleetwood*.

In the same vol. p. 411. and 412.* Sir *John* Russell is said to have been at first a royalist, but afterwards a colonel of foot, under the Earl of Manchester, and to have distinguished himself at the battle of *Marston Moor*: and yet we had been told just before, that he was baptized at Chippenham, Oct. 6. 1632, which was *not quite twelve years* before the battle of *Marston Moor*. The first edition, indeed says, that he was baptized Oct. 6. 1640; and it is well known, that the battle of *Marston-Moor*, where it seems he was colonel of foot, and behaved with very great gallantry, was fought in 1644. At any rate, my Lord; it is very unlikely, that Sir John Russell was at the battle of *Marston-moor*, and still much more so, that he should there have *distinguished himself*. Surely. it must be exceedingly remarkable, that the very glaring absurdity of this account should escape our author's notice,

In page 375 of the same vol. Lady *Elizabeth* Claypoole is called *Mary*. And in vol. 1. page 143. a certain picture of the same lady, is supposed to have been painted when she was *in the decline of life*: and yet it appears by our author's own account, that she was *not thirty* years of age when she died.—It is at least quite unusual, to consider people of that age, as in the decline of life. In p. 133. we read, that it is most probable that *Oliver* the younger, had his commission in 1642, when he was, *about twenty one* years of age; and yet we had been told just before, that he was born in the beginning of 1623.

In vol. 2. p. 217.† it is said of Colonel Jones,

that

*p. 392 and 393 1st. edit.

†p. 273. 1st. edit.

that he seemed by some expressions to *acquiesce in the justice of his sentence.*" But those expressions, my Lord, contain not the least indication of any such thing—they only shew his remarkable serenity and magnanimity of mind, in the prospect of death: such serenity and magnanimity as must have proceeded from a consciousness of innocence, and of course, of the *injustice* of the sentence that had been passed upon him. In p. 218. we read of a certain friend of Jones's, that was once *to have accompanied him* in one of his voyages to Ireland; but, by what follows it appears, that he *actually did accompany him* at that time.

Many of the errors of the Memoirs, my Lord, are the offspring of false reasoning, and some appear to have proceeded from ignorance: not a few of them are greatly tinged with illiberality and prejudice; and are, to use one of our author's expressions, "only pardonable from the wretchedness of a narrow mind."

Our memorialist in vol. 1. p. 4.* (note) reflects upon Dr. Gibbons for calling the Cathedral of St. David's, a *temple*; and gravely observes, that he "should have recollected, that St. David never had any *temples* built to his honour." But he himself, my Lord, ought also to have *recollected*, that the doctor did not say, the saint ever had any *temples built to his honour*. He indeed *called the Cathedral a TEMPLE*; and at any rate, there could be no very great impropriety in that. Had he called it a *CHRISTIAN temple*, Mr. Noble, I suppose, would not have been at all displeased with him. He also, in the same note, corrects the doctor, for calling *Avisa*, a *Scythian Infidel*; whom he rather supposes to have been a *Pagan Dane*. And he affirms that we

read

*p. 5. 1st. edit.

read of no SCYTHIANS invading any part of Britain. But, my Lord, if he have not, his acquaintance with the works of British antiquaries and historians, must be very small—too small surely, by much, for a F. S. A.—Even *Bede* in his *Ecclesiastical History*, *Camden* in his *Britannia*, and *Stillingfleet* in his *Origines Britannicae*, (works that are in every body's hands) have mentioned the invasion of these Islands by the *Scythians*. And very lately the same has been mentioned by *Vallancey*, in his *vindication of the ancient history of Ireland*, (published in No. XV. of the *Collectanea de rebus Hibernicis*,) and by *Pemberton*, in his *Dissertation on the origin and progress of the Scythians*.

Mr. Noble, says (vol. i. edit. 1. p. 121. note) “that we have every reason to suppose, that *Sir Thomas Stewart* died before his nephew *Oliver's* conversion to puritanism: for it is scarce to be thought of, (says he,) that so loyal and orthodox a person, should have made one of so opposite sentiments his heir.” Was *Oliver's* junction with the puritans, then, a more heinous deed in itself, or a greater offence against his uncle, than his most vile attempt to deprive that same uncle of his estate and of his liberty, by the means of a commission of Lunacy?—Is not—as the uncle forgave that offence, and generously made the offender his heir—might he not pass by the other likewise, notwithstanding his own very strict loyalty, and orthodoxy? or does Mr. Noble suppose, that loyalty and orthodoxy are such kind of things, as must necessarily banish all natural affection, all the ties and feelings of consanguinity, and every spark of the virtue of placability for ever out of the human breast? There is, my Lord, something so very mean, unequitable, and intolerant, in the above remark, as cannot fail of laying the author's character extremely low

low, in the estimation of every man of a reasonable and liberal mind.

In pages 125 and 126 it is asserted, upon the authority of the duchess of Lauderdale, and Dr. Echard, that *Oliver confessed* to his wife one morning in bed, *that he had been guilty of injustice to Charles Stuart*; (i. e. Charles II.) which is not at all probable. It is not pretended, that either the duchess or the doctor, or any one else, except the protectress, had heard him make that confession: and were it possible to suppose that he really made such a confession to her, it would still remain quite incredible that *she* should have divulged it. The protectress, my Lord, was a woman of extraordinary discretion, and one that loved her husband.

Oliver's life, we know, was very far from being blameless. His faults, as well as his virtues, were many and great. But our author is so far from being disposed to extenuate or diminish the former, that he often appears determined at all events, to aggravate and multiply them. Nothing ought to have been laid to his charge without proper and sufficient vouchers: and yet, my Lord, this is very frequently done in the course of these Memoirs.

Because Oliver happened to declare in a letter to his cousin *Mrs. St. John*, that he had formerly *loved darknefs—bated godlinefs*, was a *chief of sinners*, &c.* Our memorialist concludes, that he had been certainly in his youth, a *debauched person*. But he ought to have known, that others have made similar declarations, who nevertheless cannot be suspected of ever having led dissolute lives. Even the apostle Paul has declared, that he was himself once a *blasphemer*, a *persecutor* and *injurious*, and even a *chief of sinners*; yet nobody has ventured thence to infer, that he was

*p. 131. 1st. —p. 109. 2d. edit.

in his youth, a *debauched person*: nor can there be any foundation for such an inference. But let us hear our author further—“*Carrington* in his history of Oliver, dedicated to his son Richard, *wholly passes over the former part of his life*, as knowing it to be too culpable to be pleasing to his son to hear of.”—Well, and what does all this signify? Why, a very great deal, it seems, my Lord. It even amounts to *another clear proof*, that Oliver was in his youth a *debauchee*. Carrington, forsooth, could not possibly pass over the former part of his life on any other account. Besides, *the former part of the Protector's life*, your Lordship must know, *was CULPABLE*,—*too culpable*, (if your friend's judgment may be relied upon) *to be pleasing to his son to hear of*: THEREFORE, without all doubt, *it must have been DISSOLUTE*! In short he insists, that we have *the greatest reason to believe* from the premises, that Oliver was in the earlier part of life, a *debauched person*. There is no trusting, my Lord, but the man who is capable of reasoning at this rate, may another time take it into his head, to conclude from the very same premises, that the Protector was in the earlier part of life, a *highwayman*, or even a *king of the Gipsies*! For my own part, I must declare, to your Lordship, that I cannot but consider *Mr. Farrar's* testimony, “That they have no traces in the neighbourhood of Huntingdon, of Oliver's having led a dissolute life,”* as far outweighing all that our memorialist has advanced on the other side.

In page 126.† it is said, that the Protector *is known to have indulged himself*, after he arrived at power, *with the company of ladies*, and that *not in the most innocent manner*.” If such a thing be known, my Lord, it may doubtless be proved; and Mr. Noble

* p. 110.

† p. 156 edit. 1.

I must think, ought to have accompanied such an assertion with *good proofs*. Nothing however of that kind appears.—We are only amused with such tales as, that *Lady Dysert*, and *Mrs. Lambert* have been frequently GIVEN as his mistresses, —that they were ladies of very different accomplishments; the former beautiful, witty, learned, and full of intrigue; ; the latter devout, and, according to *Heath's* account, a woman of good birth, good parts, and of pleasing attractions, both for mind and body.—That his acquaintance with the gay lady Dysert, gave such offence to the godly, that he was obliged to decline his visits to her—that IT WAS THOUGHT *general Tollemache* owed his birth to Oliver; but there could no hurt arise in holding heavenly meditations with *Mrs. Lambert*—that it was a court jest, that the protector's instrument (of government) was found under lady Lambert's petticoat—that there is a history printed, of a pretended natural son of the protector's; but is too marvellous to be true—that probably, however, Oliver had natural children; one of whom might be *Dr. Millington*; after whose name in the register of *Strensham*, is "*Query*, was not he a bastard of Oliver Cromwell?"—that to the belief of this the Author is the more inclined, because in the postscript of a letter from *Ursula Hornyhold*, dated London, Dec. 4. 1744, to a gentleman in the vicinity of that place, it is written, "did you ever hear it SAID, that *Dr. Millington* was illegitimate? here has been TALK that Doctor Millington was a bastard of Oliver Cromwell."

Such is the manner, my Lord, in which your friend supports the charge of a criminal connection with the ladies against the protector Oliver. At this rate, any person in the world, who has been evil spoken of, may be easily criminated: so that
innocence

innocence and virtue can protect no man from infamy, if the demon of *slander* have ever happened to pay him any particular attention. Surely, whatever *orthodoxy*, or *loyalty*, this sort of reasoning may discover, its *candor* and *justice* must not be once mentioned; for verily, my Lord, it leaves every thing of that kind totally out of the question.

In p. 130. it is said, there is reason to suppose she [the Protectress] *had some blemish in one eye.*" But, my Lord, if there be any reason to suppose so, that reason does not seem to be in Mr. Noble's possession. The words alluded to, ("though I winkt of an eye"—p. 411. edit. 1.) if they refer to her, do not appear to mean any more than, that she *connived* at the steps her husband took to gratify his ambition. Our author, moreover, affirms, *that the protectress was certainly in her person very ordinary.* That, likewise, seems to be more than he can *prove.* The quotation from Cowley will not prove it. It is rather a proof of the *meanness of her disposition*, than that of her *person.* Nor will the *engraving* he speaks of amount to a proof of it:—The *title* of the book, to which that engraving is prefixed, and the *figure of a monkey* in the upper part of the print, are plain indications (whatever *Granger* might imagine) that it ought to be viewed in no other light than that of a *caricatura.* It does our memorialist no manner of credit, my Lord, that a copy of that engraving appears in the front of one of his volumes.

In p. 71. A certain *contest* at the election of a burghers to represent the *town of Huntingdon* in parliament, is mentioned as a method of convincing the King, who had the greatest interest in *that county.*—Charles II. for aught I know, in whose reign that contest took place, might be very well satisfied with such a mode of conviction: and Mr. Noble him-

self seems not in the least to disapprove of it: but, my Lord, it would not do, with intelligent and reasonable people, who well know, that it is not uncommon for a man to possess an absolute power in a *borough*, who at the same time, has but little or no interest in the *county* where that borough lies.

In vol. 2. p. 41.* (edit. 1.) the late Mr. *Hervey* is called *the gloomy Mr. Hervey*, and is said to have, in his *meditations*, mentioned *Sir James Stonehouse*, and to have there given *his monument*. It was here very *impertinent*, and, I think, *illnatured*, in our author to bestow upon *Hervey*, the name of *gloomy*. In point of *learning* as well as *genius*, he was certainly, by far, his superior. And if his religious views were very different from those of Mr. Noble, and disposed him to be grave and devout, where the other would be apt to give way to levity, ridicule, and prophaneness, still, my Lord, it may admit of some doubt, whether he really deserved the appellation of *gloomy*, any more than he does. *Hervey* had his cheerful subjects, and his cheerful seasons, as well as this writer; and many, I doubt not, will be apt to give *Hervey's* cheerfulness the preference.—As to *the monument given in the Meditations*, it is not *Sir James's*, but that of his wife *Mrs. Ann Stonehouse*, [The title of baronet did not descend to him till many years after her decease.]

In the same page, we are told, that the title of baronet is now enjoyed by *Sir John*, a descendant of the late Sir John Turner of Warham, in Norfolk, and the Lady Frances his wife; which is a mistake: The late Sir John Turner left no male issue; and the title is now extinct.—The above passage indeed, is altered in the second edition: but the alteration has introduced new blunders.—One of the daughters

*p. 37-2d. edit.

ters of Sir John Turner, is there said to have married Sir Martin Folkes, bart. *president of the Royal Society*, and to have had by him, it is thought, one son, Sir Martin, the present baronet, and three daughters." Now that Lady is the wife of the last mentioned gentleman, Sir Martin Browne Folkes, bart. and he is *not* the son of the late President of the R. S. but of his brother *William Folkes, Esq.* The president was not a baronet; nor did he leave any male issue. The mother of Sir Martin Browne Folkes was the daughter and sole heiress of the late Sir William Browne knt. M. D. and president of the Royal College of Physicians.

In p. 55. it is said, that the first Lord Masham and his Lady had the happiness of being *beloved* by that great philosopher *John Locke, Esq.* who spent ten years of his life with them, &c. This, my Lord, should have been said of *Sir Francis Masham*, his lordship's father, and his second lady *Damaris*, the very accomplished daughter of the celebrated *Dr. Cudworth*. It was *with them* Mr. Locke spent ten years, and with them too, he ended his days, the 28th. of October, 1704. The character and principles of the first Lord Masham's lady, were so very different from those of Mr. Locke, that it is absolutely impossible he should have fallen in love with her. If she had any *lovers*, they must be sought for among the *Harleys* and *Bolingbrokes* of that time.

In vol. 1. p. 447. Major General Morgan, is called Sir *John* Morgan; but should have been called Sir *Thomas* Morgan. He was a brave and able officer, not at all inferior to Lockhart, or, perhaps to any one of Oliver's great commanders. This writer has not done him justice, in the relation he has given of the gallant actions of the 6000 English in Flanders, — vol. 2. p. 247, &c. The principal share of the merit and glory of those actions

actions, is by him bestowed upon Lockhart; out certainly it was due to Morgan. In some of those actions it does not appear, that the former had any share at all; and even in the most glorious of them (the battle of Dunkirk) he did not make his appearance till the engagement was over. Morgan says he came up to him in the field, some time before the battle began, with a white cap on his head, and said, *You see what condition I am in: I am not able to give you any assistance; this day; you are the older soldier, and the greatest part of the work of this day must lie upon your shoulders.* Upon which the officers smiled; and so he bid God be with us, (says he) and went away. From which time we never saw him (adds the Major General) till we were in pursuit of the enemy, and then we could see him among us very brisk, without his white cap on his head, and neither troubled with gravel or stone.* [those being the disorders of which he had complained.] Our memorialist appears to be a very great admirer of Sir William Lockhart; and doubtless he must have been a person of very considerable abilities; but how he came to dignify him with the appellation of *Ambassador-General*, must be best known to himself: It is I believe a character unheard of before; and seems to me very much like nonsense.

In p. 402. the father of the reverend William Jones of Nayland in Suffolk, F. R. S. is said to have been a native Welshman, and descended from Oliver's lord Philip Jones: then it is added—"as a strict loyalist he never chose to mention any thing about the seal of his ancestor, especially as he died when his son was a minor." If the author, my Lord, is able to make any thing like sense or reason out of this, he

is

*See, "A true and just relation of Major General Sir Thomas Morgan's progress in France and Flanders with the 6000 English, as it was delivered by the General himself."—It may be found in the *Phoenix Britannicus*, pp. 532. &c.

is certainly endowed with intellectual abilities far superior to the rest of mankind.

In p. 151. it is asserted, that James the second's first wife was but the grand-daughter of a woman who got an honest livelihood by selling washing and grains.† Something like this, if I rightly recollect, was reported some time ago in one of the country newspapers, but I must confess that I cannot help questioning the truth of it. Our author should have told us, whose wife that poor woman was—Sir Thomas Aylesbury's or Mr. Henry Hyde's; and also upon what authority he relates the fact.—What he says of the duchess of Albemarle being the daughter of a blacksmith (p. 389.) is much less doubtful: the same has been reported by very respectable writers; and also that her mother was a woman of ill fame, and one of the five women-barbers in Drury-lane.*

In p. 111. we are told, "that the *Long Parliament* did the nation *more injury*, by their ambition, bigotry, and tyranny, *than the king had done* by his:" and in p. 420. "that Charles, at the fatal scaffold, made *far too great* an atonement for all his arbitrary and impolitic acts."—We do not wonder, my Lord, to hear this asserted by one of our author's profession. The long parliament did not behave over and above friendly towards the hierarchy, but Charles did. The former clipped the wings of *Laud*, *Mainwaring*, and the rest of the high flyers; and in the end abolished episcopacy itself: but the king was their fast friend to the last. It was therefore natural for our memorialist to magnify the crimes of the one, and to extenuate those of the other. But it is presumed that disinterested, impartial and competent judges, will differ widely from him in their views of these matters

† *Selling washing and grains*, seems to be rather an unintelligible expression.

* See Brit. Biogr. v. 5. p. 274.

matters: though they may not deem the long parliament altogether blameless, they will, nevertheless, be apt to conclude, that they made a most noble stand against the encroachments of despotism, and that we are in no small degree indebted to them for our present privileges. As to the king's death, though they may commiserate the untimely and wretched fate of an infatuated monarch, yet they will not fail to acknowledge, that it was in one respect, at least a very necessary and beneficial event, as it has furnished succeeding monarchs with a most instructive lesson, to moderate their ambition, and pay a serious regard to the grievances and remonstrances of their subjects. In short, my Lord, I will venture to say, that men of that character will be so far from asserting that Charles's death was *far too great an atonement for his crimes*, that they will rather adopt the dying words of Sir John Bourchier,—"It was a just act; God, and all good men will own it." (see vol. 2. p. 40.)

In p. 291. it is said that Charles's *coffin* with the pall thrown upon it, was found in Queen Anne's reign exactly in the same state as it was when first placed there, [i. e. at Windsor.] But was the *body* in it?—The author of the *secret history of the Calve's Head Club*, a flaming churchman, affirms (and according to him, Dr. Nalson, in his preface to the king's trial, does the same) that when the long parliament voted an honourable interment for their late prince, all was stopt, by reason that the persons ordered to regulate the ceremony, when they came to examine the royal coffin, *found the body missing*.—He also tells us that Ludlow had declared, that though Ireton and Cromwell were buried under Tyburn, yet it was a comfort to him, that the royal martyr kept them company: for foreseeing (said Ludlow)

Ludlow,) that his son would undoubtedly come in; we took care, that his father's body should not be idolatrously worshipped by the cavaliers; and therefore privately removed it to the place of common execution.*

In p. 147. we read that lady Fauconberg, certainly, always regarded the church of England as the most perfect religion; and in p. 157. that the daughters of Oliver were all of them attached to the royal family, except the eldest; and in p. 214. that Henry Cromwell died in the communion of the church of England." All this, my Lord, wants proof; and for the most part, it appears not to be true. As to Henry Cromwell, though he might frequently appear in the public assemblies of the Church of England, yet his conduct towards the ejected ministers, renders it very probable that he was still a nonconformist in his heart. And if any of the protector's daughters shewed any predilection for the English church, and the royal family, it must have been after the restoration, and not before: and then it was, in all likelihood, nothing more than paying their devoirs to the rising sun, which was the case with numbers besides them, who yet were never convinced that the church of England was more perfect than other churches, or that the Stuart family was more worthy of the crown, than any other family.

Among the many magnanimous deeds of the loyal and the orthodox, which this work has recorded, that of *Wren* bishop of Ely is not the most unworthy of observation. When that prelate was informed that Oliver offered to release him from his confinement

in

*See Secret Hist. of the Calve's Head Club, 4th. edit. pp-

in the Tower, he rejected the offer with disdain, and told the person who brought him the intelligence, that he *scorned to receive his liberty from a tyrant*. Nor would he be prevailed with to quit the prison, till the restoration set him free.† Had *Hobbes*, my Lord, been then in the bishop's place, (though he too was very *loyal*,) he would have quitted his confinement without any manner of hesitation; for it is said to have been his maxim, that "*if he were cast into a deep pit, and the devil should put down his cloven foot, he would take bold of it to be drawn out by it.*" But the philosopher of *Malmsbury*, was a man of a very different humour from bishop *Wren*. Our memorialist, my Lord, has not told us, that greatly as this most loyal and orthodox divine detested tyranny, in the person of Oliver Cromwell, *scorning* to accept, even his liberty at his hands, he nevertheless did not *scorn* to act the tyrant himself afterwards in his own diocese. So absolute and savage, my Lord, was the dominion he exercised over his people, that he would not suffer any, whether clergy or laity, male or female, to introduce *divinity*, so much as into their *table talk*. Nor did he less distinguish himself as a *preacher*, if we may judge by the following specimen—Text, Psal. 44. 17. "Of this text now we are to treat. But no, that we may be more than sure, if more may be, pray let's look on it once again. Yet *do* we not forget thee, nor *behave* ourselves *frowardly* in thy covenant; so goes our old translation, that is sure. But then, *yet have we not forgotten thee*, neither have we *dealt falsely* in thy covenant, our *new* translation goes so; and here is some difference in words. But howsoever, these differing couples, *have not*, and *do not*, *deal*, and *behave ourselves*, *frowardly* and *falsely*; in effect they come both to one, and

† vol. 2. p. 381.

and so all! is the same, and it is no other, I assure you, in the Latine, and the Greek, and the Hebrew. *So that by the grace of God we are cocksure of the text itself every way.*" Sermon on *abandoning of the Scottish Covenant*, printed in 1662.†

Many of Oliver's great men, my Lord, are treated by this writer with a very large share of indignity, for no other reason but their being persons of mean extraction.—*General Skippon* we are told, was originally a *waggoner*,† *Sir Thomas Pride*, a *foundling in a church-porch*, and afterwards a *drayman*—*Sir John Barkstead*, a *working Silversmith*.§—*Sir John Hewson*, sprung from the *dregs* of the people, first a *Cobler*, then a *Shoemaker*.—*Colonel Berry*, a *woodmonger*, then a *servant or clerk* in some *Ironworks*—*General Whalley*, a *broken Clothier*,†† &c. &c.

Now all these men, my Lord, were unquestionably descended from *Adam and Eve*;* and we are very sure that *Mr. Noble* himself, or even *Bourbon and Nassau*, cannot go higher.* We are sure too, that they

F were

† The author has not seen the Sermon itself, but gives this specimen of it on the authority of Mr. Robinson of Cambridge, who has published it in his notes upon *Claude's Essay*, vol. 1. p. 210.

† "It is pretended that he was once a waggoner to *Sir Francis Vere*," are Mr. Noble's words.

§ It is added—"If we may believe the Cavalier party."

†† Here it should be observed, however, that Mr. Noble owns this to be a *thing almost impossible*.

* Alluding to Prior's well known epitaph, and to a more ancient one, said to have been found somewhere in Scotland, from which Prior is supposed to have taken the hint. The former reads thus,

"Nobles and Heralds, by your leave,

Here lie the bones of Matthew Prior.

The son of Adam and of Eve,

Let Bourbon and Nassau go higher."

The latter is as follows,

"Johnie Carnagie lies here,

Descended of Adam and Eve,

If any can gang higher,

I'll willingly give them leave."

were men of very considerable abilities; of which their being employed and promoted by Cromwell, is a very sufficient proof, were there no other, which is by no means the case. Their personal accomplishments were certainly much more than sufficient to remove every disadvantage they might have derived from the meanness of their birth. I cannot however, believe that the origin of every one of them was altogether so low as this writer has represented it. In a *List of the other House*, published in 1658, by a warm republican, who appears to be well acquainted with their history, but who was no friend of theirs, and therefore not disposed to conceal any thing that might contribute to their disparagement, I find the matter differently represented in several instances.— There I read—“*Major General Skippon*, sometimes called, the honest English Captain in the Netherlands, was afterwards Captain of those of the Artillery ground in London; who refusing to attend the king at York, when he sent unto him, and adhering to the Parliament, was by them made major General under the Earl of Essex,” &c. Here it appears that the king would gladly have employed him, if he could have prevailed with him; but not a word is said of his being originally a *waggoner*. Skippon's extraordinary merit was so very conspicuous, that the long parliament, of which he was a member, found it necessary to dispense with the *self-denying ordinance* in his favour, as our author himself acknowledges: (p. 399.) an honour which I believe they paid to no one else, except *Cromwell*. His great military talents were accompanied with fervent piety, and inviolable integrity; so that the appellation of *the honest English Captain*, bestowed on him while in foreign service, was not *unmerited*. His honesty, however, exposed him to no small difficulties

ties when he was abroad, as may be gathered from a hint dropt in a book of his published in 1643.* By that book it also appears, that his piety was far from being of a contemptible sort, that his intellectual abilities were respectable, and that he was possessed of a competent share of learning.‡

Of *Pride* too, I read in the forementioned *list of the other house*,—"Colonel Pride, then Sir Thomas, now Lord Pride; sometime an honest *Brewer* in London." But not a word is said of his being originally a *foundling* in a church porch, or a *drayman*.—Of *Barkstead*, I read, "Colonel Barkstead, then Sir John, now Lord Barkstead; sometime a *Goldsmith* in the Strand,"—Of *Berry*, "Colonel Berry; his original was from the *Ironworks*, as a *clerk* or *overseer*,"—Of *Whalley*, "Colonel Whalley, formerly a *Woollen-draper*, or *petty merchant* in London." This account, my Lord, is that of the *Republicans*, who were greatly disgusted with Cromwell's men and measures; so that there is reason to apprehend, that it is by no means clear of exaggeration: that of Mr. Noble is the account of

*That hint is contained in the following verses, which may be found at the beginning of the book, immediately before the dedication.

"Can he be poore whose portion is
God's free and faithful promises?
Much I have lost, and still may lose,
Farewell to all: these things I choose.
Beyond Sea, service me undid,
Because to shirk, conscience forbid.
I am not like (as 'tis) to gaine,
Except my labour for my paine,
I then did trust, and still will make,
God's promises my surest stake:
His promis'd help I then did finde,
More of the same is still behind.
Can I be poore whose portion is
God's free and faithful promises?"

Skippon's Salve for every Sore.

‡ It appears also from the title page of that book, that Skippon was *Sergeant major-general* in 1643, which contradicts what Mr. Noble asserts p. 399.

of the *Cavaliers*, and may be supposed to be still more highly exaggerated. It is no wonder, that the wretched tools of Charles's cause, should run any lengths to vilify the characters of these men, when even their master could stoop, in one of his proclamations, to call the great Oliver himself *a mechanic fellow*. But, my Lord, if Cromwell advanced to exalted stations men of low birth, your Lordship well knows, that others of our English Sovereigns have done the very same: of which *Wolsey* and *Thomas Cromwell*, are instances, in the reign of Harry the eighth; Sir *Cloudsley Shovel* and *Prior* in those of *William* and *Anne*; and even in the reign of *George the third*, some instances of the kind, I believe, may be found. One of our present *Bishops* is said to have been originally an apprentice to a *weaver*, and another of them is, it seems, but the son of a *broken shop-keeper*. For my own part, however, I do not consider this as any manner of disgrace to either of them, provided they do not abuse their power, as many bishops have done, and are careful to lead quiet and good lives.

My Lord, if our memorialist is often very severe upon Cromwell and his favourites, he is no less so on those of the Commonwealth party in general, whom he frequently distinguishes, in his sarcastical way, by such names as, *Saints*, *heavenly men*, the *godly*, the *godly party*, &c. In short, my Lord, he seems to wish, that his readers should consider them as a most execrable crew, and a *set of canting hypocrites*. To which it may be said, nearly in the words of a very sensible writer—"We have no doubt but there were among them many ridiculous characters, and many hypocritical pretenders to religion; but we suppose there were also some of this sort among the Royalists and Episcopalians. That there were

among the Nonconformists as well as among the Episcopals, great numbers who were men of sincere piety, and upright intentions, can be questioned by no man of candor of any party; and if there were more hypocrites among the Nonconformists, than among the cavalier party, it must have arisen from this, that a man could obtain little credit with the former, without regarding external decency at least in his conduct. But this, my Lord, seems not to have been the case with the Cavaliers. A man might swear, curse, drink, whore, and game, and live in a very dissolute and debauched manner, and yet be considered as a very passable son of the church, provided he would toast the king and the bishops. They had, therefore, little temptation to assume the appearance of regularity of conduct, when they had no inclination to it. And though some of the episcopal clergy were unquestionably men of respectable characters, there were, too many of them who cared very little how immoral men were, provided they seemed disposed to support the revenues of the church. And ready as many of the royalists were to cast the reproach of hypocrisy upon others, may we not ask, whether it was not a species of hypocrisy for men so licentious in their conduct as many of the Cavaliers were, to make pretences of an attachment to any religion at all? and yet it is evident, that, in the midst of their debauches, many of them pretended a mighty affection for the church of England.

Your friend, my Lord, in one place, charges the commonwealthsmen, and particularly *Owen* and *Goodwin*, with the very singular crime of *unsainting the Apostles*; which, I suppose, refers to the well known custom of that party, of *not* prefixing the word *saint* to the names of the apostles, when they had

had occasion to mention them. Instead of saying *Saint John, Saint Paul, Saint Peter, &c.* they would say, *the Apostle John, the Apostle Paul, the Apostle Peter, &c.* and sometimes only *John, Paul, Peter, &c.* This did not proceed from a mean opinion of the Apostles' holiness, or even from a high opinion of their own, as this writer very ungenerously insinuates, for they appear to have been, at least, as free from those faults, as any of their episcopalian neighbours, but it seems rather to have proceeded from a persuasion that the other practice was superstitious and absurd, and therefore, by all means to be avoided. In truth, my Lord, there can be no better reason for prefixing the word *saint* to the names of the *apostles*, than there is for doing so to those of the *prophets* and the *patriarchs*; so that those who contend for the use of such names as *Saint Matthew, Saint Thomas, and Saint James*, ought to contend also for the use of such as *Saint Abraham, Saint Job, and Saint Moses*.

My Lord, I beg leave here to observe, that the manner in which the famous Colonel *Lilburne* is mentioned in these Memoirs, cannot in any degree redound to your friend's credit. He has handed to us the name of that honest man with marks of particular antipathy.—In one place he calls him *Lilburne the factious*;^{*} and in another, *John Lilburne of combustible memory*.[†] Surely had there existed the least spark of candour in his composition, he would not have refrained from dropping some hint concerning that *integrity* and *genuine patriotism*, which formed so conspicuous and so considerable a part of *Lilburne's* character. *David Hume* did him more justice when he said, "He was the most turbulent, but

^{*} vol. 1. p. 133.

[†] vol. 2. p. 454.

but the most upright and courageous of human kind."† But I have never seen his character more fairly drawn than by a very judicious writer now living, and which I will take the liberty of laying before your Lordship in his own words.—"JOHN LILBURNE (says he) was a man of a most undaunted spirit, in his private life irreproachable, and attached to the cause of liberty to a degree even of enthusiasm. He has been generally represented as a man of a most contentious and quarrelsome temper; and we are told that Sir Henry Martin said of him, "That if there were none living but him, John would be against Lilburne, and Lilburne against John." But Lilburne seems not to have had justice done him: he did, indeed, oppose the illegal exertions of prerogative, as well as the unjust exercise of parliamentary power. But in both he was consistent; for he appeared always disposed to oppose tyranny, under whatever form it appeared: and, perhaps, if all the matters of contention in which he was engaged, were candidly and thoroughly examined, it would be found that he was not often in the wrong.§"

Of all the glaring misrepresentations which I have met with in the Memoirs, I do not remember any one that surpasses the *character of Vavasor Powel*, given in vol. 1. pp. 180. and 181. The author seems to have taken no small pains to hold up to his readers the name of that man, as an object of the most perfect contempt and detestation. How far his representation may be relied on, will appear from the following short, but faithful sketch of the life and character of the same person.—Mr. Vavasor Powel, my Lord, was a native of Radnorshire, and descended from a very ancient and honourable fami-

† Hist. of Eng. vol. vii. p. 209. 8vo. edit.

§ See British Biography vol. 6. p. 69.

ly. He was related to some of the best families in his native county, and also in those of *Montgomery*, and *Salop*. He received a very liberal education, first in his own country, and afterwards at *Jesus College* in *Oxford*; and made a good proficiency in the learned languages. He was born in the year 1617, and went into orders sometime before the year 1640, and officiated at first as a curate to his uncle Mr. Erasmus Powel. But it was not long, before he left the established church, and joined the Puritans, from a conviction that their principles were more agreeable to the scriptures. He after that, preached in different parts of his native country, with very great diligence and success, though furiously opposed and persecuted by the *Laudean* party. His enemies at length brought matters to such a pass, as to oblige him to desist, and remove to England. This happened in the year 1642. He remained in England for some years; partly in London, partly in the Army, and partly at Dartford in Kent, (but for the most part in London and Dartford) where he preached with much approbation. In 1646, the storm in his own country having somewhat subsided, he was very much solicited to return; which he did, after due consideration; receiving at the same time a very honourable testimonial, or certificate, from the synod of Ministers, which then sat for the trial of all public preachers.* In the following year,

[i. e. 1647]

* The following is a copy of the abovementioned Certificate.

"These are to certify those whom it may concern, that the bearer hereof, Mr. *Varvasor Powel*, is a man of a religious and blameless conversation, and of able gifts for the work of the ministry, and hath approved himself faithful therein: which we whose names are underwritten, do testify: some of our own knowledge, others from credible and sufficient information: And therefore he

(i. e. 1647) he went to *Anglesey* in the quality of preacher to the parliament forces employed in the reduction of that Island; which charge he undertook at the request of the chief officers who commanded those forces. No sooner was the object of the *Anglesey* expedition obtained, than he quitted the army, and returned to his favourite employment. From that time to the *Restoration*, he applied himself, with the most unwearied diligence, to the work of propagating the Gospel in his own country. No minister of that time, my Lord, was more laborious, or more extensively useful than he was. There was scarce a market-town, or a single district in the principality, that did not partake of the benefit of his labours. A great number of christian churches, were by him gathered in that country; some of them consisting of *four* and *five hundred* members: and the whole number of hearers, to at least, as many more. Nor was his ministry more painful, or his usefulness more extensive, than his private character was fair and respectable. *The Long Parliament*, the most venerable assembly of the kind that this Island, perhaps, ever saw, were very sensible

he being now called and desired to exercise his gifts in his own country of Wales, he also having the language thereof, we conceive him fit for that work, and worthy of encouragement therein. In witness whereof we here subscribed our Names, Sept. 11. 1646.

Charles Herte, Prolocutor.

Henry Scudder,
William Greenhill,
Franc. Woodcock,
William Strong,
Joseph Caryl,
William Carter,
Thomas Wilson,
Jer. Burroughs,
Philip Nye.

Stephen Marshall,
Jer. Whitaker,
Arthur Salwey,
Peter Sterry,
Henry Prince,
Christopher Love,
Thomas Froyfell,
Robert Bettes.

ble of his merit, and treated him with particular tokens of esteem. *Cromwell* too, the wisest and greatest prince of his time, respected him, at least, till he assumed the *sovereignty*—a measure which *Mr. Powel* disapproved of, and vigorously opposed, and which I think, was the only instance wherein he particularly interfered with *politics*.

At the *Restoration* it could not be expected that such a man as *Powel* should meet with any favour. Had he been a person of no principle, and of an abandoned character, he might, indeed, have stood some chance, then, for protection, and even for preferment. But he was of quite another stamp—a thorough honest and good man; and, one who would prophecy no good of the kingdom of the priests:—a crime which the prelates, and the rest of the clerical tribe would never forgive him; and which, therefore, rendered his ruin inevitable. In April 1660, he was committed to Shrewsbury Gaol, where he remained about *nine weeks*; and then he was discharged by an order from the King and Council. When he regained his liberty, he went into *Montgomeryshire*. and continued to preach as usual; but was in a short time interrupted, and ordered to desist, by Sir M. P. High Sheriff of that county.* And as he did not think proper to comply with that order, the High Sheriff wrote a letter to *Secretary Morice*, wherein he charged him with *Sedition, Rebellion, and Treason*. In consequence of which, he was again imprisoned, and treated with great severity for several months; especially at the assizes which took place in the course of that time; where the Judge would neither suffer him to be tried for the crimes which had been laid to his charge, (though the prisoner was very desirous of it) nor yet accept of any bail for him.

While

* Not of *Merionethshire*, as Mr. Noble said.

While he lay in that prison, a false information was lodged against him by some of his enemies, and a messenger was sent down to bring him before the *King and Council*: and though no proof of any crime could appear, yet such were the justice and humanity of his majesty and his council, that he was immediately committed to the *Fleet* prison, where he remained almost two years; for the greatest part of which time, he was so closely confined, as not to be suffered to go out of his chamber; which together with the offensive smell of a dunghill that lay just before his window, so impaired his health, that he never after fully recovered.

During his confinement in the *Fleet*, his enemies were not idle: not satisfied with the cruelties exercised upon his body, and as if they wanted to fill up the measure of their wickedness; they endeavoured, with truly infernal baseness, to destroy his good name, by propagating certain slanderous reports concerning him. Those reports were not only totally false and malicious, but they even had been fully disproved, a good while before, by some of his friends, in a tract, entitled, *Examen et purgamen Vavasoris*. Nevertheless, that his persecutors might not have the least room for triumph, or his friends for dismay, he now published a particular vindication of himself, wherein he effectually obviated every remaining shadow of a foundation for the calumnies that had been raised against him—challenging his adversaries, at the same time, to come forward and gainsay any thing he had advanced.* To this piece no rejoinder ever appeared. In vain, however, did he justify his character: for his innocence could procure him no redress. He was on the 30th of

* This Tract was entitled *A brief Narrative concerning the proceedings of the Commissioners in Wales, &c.*

of Sept. 1662, suddenly removed from the *Fleet* prison, to *South-Sea Castle*, by *Portsmouth*, where he was closely confined for about five years. Upon the fall of *Clarendon*, when the power of Archbishop *Skeldon*, bishops *Morley*, *Ward*, *Gunning*, and others of the bloody patrons of intolerance, was somewhat reduced, Mr. *Powel* sued for a *Habeas Corpus*; and soon after, by an order from the King and Council, obtained his liberty. From this time, scarce *ten months* had elapsed, before he was again imprisoned, as he was passing through the counties of *Monmouth* and *Glamorgan*, in his way to his own habitation. It was pretended that he had entered the town of *Newport*, in *Monmouthshire* at the head of a *thousand horsemen*; and that he had assembled, at *Mertbur*, in *Glamorganshire*, abundance of people, a *thousand at least*; and, that *many of them* were armed: all which was a palpable falsehood. A certain *Clergyman*, was then his *principal accuser*; and he went so far as to *swear* to the truth of his information.

Hard and cruel was the treatment he now met with. After he had remained many months in the county prison of *Glamorganshire*, a friend in *London* procured a writ of *Habeas Corpus*, to remove him to the court of *Common Pleas*: which the *Sheriff* refused to obey. Then came an *Alias*, under penalty of a *100l.* which produced the desired effect. But he had no notice of his removal, till about *eight o'clock in the evening*, when the *under Sheriff* came, and ordered him to make ready to depart in *half an hour*. This was the *16th, of Oct. 1669*. He arrived in *London*, and appeared at the *Common Pleas* bar, the *22d*, of the same month; where, upon the examination of the return, it was found *illegal*, but was left to be further considered the next day, as the council employed against him pleaded, that he had not had sufficient time to think upon it. Mr. *Powel* then

then moved the court to take bail, and to discharge his guard; which they, at first, seemed very willing to do, but afterwards refused, at the instance of the council for the prosecution. The next day, the return was again argued; and the Prisoner had the liberty to open his case himself; but though the return was, by all the judges, adjudged *false and illegal*; yet he could not regain his liberty, but was the same day committed to the *Fleet Prison*—from a similar motive, as we may very reasonably suppose, with that which had formerly induced *Felix* to leave *Paul* bound: that is, *to please his enemies*.*

Mr. *Powel* after this, remained in prison till he was discharged by *death*, on the 27th of Oct. 1670:†—the 53d year of his age, and the 11th. of his imprisonment. He was a person of the strictest integrity, the most fervent piety, and the most fearless courage. He was also a warm *republican*, a zealous *nonconformist*, and a strenuous advocate for civil and religious liberty. None of his principles were subversive of good order, or inimical to the true interests of his country, and to the welfare of all mankind.§—After all, it must not be thought very marvellous, that such writers as our memorialist should represent him as a *fool*, a *poor insatuated wretch*, a *wild enthusiast*, a *seditionous person*, a *fifth monarchy man*, and one who perhaps aspired to be PRIME MINISTER to king *Jesus*. Men of our author's complexion, have always despised, reviled, and persecuted such people as *Vavasor Powel*.

* See Acts xxiv. 27.

† A further account of him may be seen in Crosby's Hist. of the English Baptists: and also in his own Life, published in 1671.

§ The following passage may serve to shew how unjustly *Vavasor Powel* has been charged with being an enemy to civil government.—It is that article in his CONFESSION OF FAITH, Concerning Magistrates and Rulers,

1st. Magistracy

Powel. As to the piece entitled, *A true Catalogue, &c.* which Mr. Noble ascribes to him; the writer of his *Life* makes no mention of his having ever written such a piece, and therefore, I think, we may very safely venture to affirm, that *he was not the author of it.*

My Lord; I have dwelt the more largely on the history of this very worthy person, as it has been so shamefully misrepresented by our memorialist. In obedience to the voice of truth and justice, I have endeavoured to rescue the memory of a respectable individual, from the infamy to which the foul and savage

1st. Magistracy is an ordinance of God: and rulers or magistrates (whether supreme or subordinate) are God's ministers; reigning by, under, and for him; entrusted with the sword of justice, for the encouragement and praise of such as do well, but a terror to evil works, or a revenger, and executor of wrath, upon those that do evil. Rom. 13. 2. 14. 1 Pet. 2. 14. 1st. Tim. 2. 2. Prov. 8. 16. 17. 2 Chron. 19. 6.

2. The most high God, who is King of Kings, and Lord of Lords, who ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever he will, he exalteth and pulleth down, altereth and removeth Kings and other Rulers at his pleasure: (Psal. 75. 6. 7. Dan. 4. 25. 2 Chron. 11. 4. 2 King, 9. 3. 6. 7.) sometimes giving bad Rulers, and at other times taking away such as are good, in a way of judgment for the sin of a people. 1 Sam. 8. 16. 19. Hosea 13. 11. 2 Chron. 34. 28.

3. Though the worst Rulers do not reign without the prescience and permission of God, yet such Governors as rule contrary to the revealed will of God, and to the true end of government, do rule without God's approbation, and are accounted by him as no rulers: (Hosea 11. 4. Ezek. 34. 5. 10. 21. Jer. 5. 1.) And some of them are said in scripture to have their power with, and to exercise it for the beast; and therefore are called the horns of the Dragon, and of the beast. Dan. 7. 20. 24. Rev. 13. 1. and 17. 3. 16.

4. As it is unlawful for Rulers to command any thing that God hath forbidden, and compel men to obey the same, or to forbid any thing that God commands: so it is lawful for the servants of God to disobey such commands. Dan. 3. 18. & 6. 10. 11. Acts 4. 19. 20. & 5. 29.

savage pen of your friend had consigned it, above a hundred years after he had been laid in his grave.

Here, my Lord, it may not be improper to observe, that *Vavasor Powel* was one of the *eight thousand protestant Nonconformists* who perished in prisons and dungeons, in the memorable reign of CHARLES II. *Sheldon*, *Morley*, *Ward*, *Gunning*, and other prelates, were their principal enemies, and the chief promoters of the very bloody persecution that had been raised against them. Archbishop *Sheldon*, was indefatigable in this truly diabolical business. He employed all his interest at court, all his influence in the country, and all his authority in the church, to harass and destroy the nonconformists. One time he wrote a *circular letter* to all the bishops of his province, requiring them to send him a particular account of all the conventicles within their respective dioceses, and of the number that frequented them, and whether they thought they might be easily suppressed by the civil magistrate. When he received this information, he went to the *king*, and obtained a *proclamation* to put the laws in execution against the dissenters, and especially against the preachers, to whom he bore a peculiar spite. By this measure, he entirely ruined a project that had just then been formed for the relief of those people.

Some time after, the same archbishop wrote *another circular letter*, directing all ecclesiastical judges and officers, to search out all nonconformists, and holders of conventicles, and especially the preachers, and to spare none: and he hoped (he said) by *God's blessing*, and the assistance of the civil power, that in a few months there would be such alterations in the distractions of the times, as would redound to the glory of God, the welfare of the church, and the praise of his majesty's government.

Some

Some of the bishops are said to have been exceedingly forward and zealous to promote the metropolitan's projects.

In the diocese of Salisbury, bishop *Ward*, ruled with great severity; and the persecution, it seems, was no where hotter than within his jurisdiction. Many hundreds were driven from their business, and obliged to leave their families exposed to the resentment of merciless, and cruel persecutors; who paid no more regard to the distresses of their fellow creatures, than if they had not been of the same species with themselves. *Ward* one time took it into his head to give a public challenge to the Presbyterians, Independents, Baptists, and Quakers, and appointed three days to dispute with them. On the first day he went into the pulpit, and there before a large congregation, charged the *Presbyterians* with rebellion, and then went away, and would not hear any thing they had to offer in their own defence. Whether the *Independents* and *Baptists* thought it worth their while to meet him, I have not been able to learn: but when the day appointed for disputing with the *Quakers* came, they called together their friends, and when his lordship began to rail at them, they returned him the compliment in his own way, and followed him to his house with repeated cries—*The hireling fleeth!* Those good people appear upon this occasion, to have gained a complete victory over the haughty prelate.

My Lord, it was said by one of the ancient sages,* and the saying is doubtless very true, that *oppression maketh a wise man mad*: we must not therefore be much surpris'd, if the dissenters of the last age did not always treat such men as bishop *Ward* in the most ceremonious manner; or if the

Quakers

* Solomon, Eccl. vii. 7.

Quakers in particular, did not treat their supercilious opponent with much ceremony on the forementioned occasion.

It must, however, be observed in justice to the *Quakers*, that they behaved; in general, during that miserable reign, with as much propriety as any of their oppressed neighbours. They remained steady and peaceable in spite of all persecution. They met in the most perilous times, at the same place and hour as usual; and when the officers came to seize them, they did not attempt to escape, but went all to prison in a body, with countenances free from the least symptom of dejection, and which expressed such remarkable serenity of mind, as could only proceed from a consciousness of innocence. Nor would they petition for liberty, or pay the fines imposed upon them, not even so much as the gaol fees. When they were set at liberty, they would go to their meeting-house as before—and after their meeting-houses had been nailed up by order, they would assemble in the streets before the doors, saying, that they would neither be ashamed or afraid of meeting together, in a peaceable manner, to worship God; but in imitation of the *prophet Daniel*, would do it the more publicly, because they were forbidden. By this firmness they at length gained their point, and vanquished the tyranny of the government.* Nor has their behaviour been less becoming since the Revolution. They have given ample proof, as well as the other denominations of dissenters, that they are justly entitled to the protection

H

tion

* A further account of these matters, and those before mentioned may be found in Harris's *Life of Charles II.* Brit. Biogr. lives of *Penn, Ward, &c.* Neal's *Hist. of the Puritans.* Crosby's *History of the English Baptists.* Murray's *History of the Churches in England and Scotland.* The *Phoenix, &c.*

tion of the laws, and the esteem of the nation. Indeed, as a very respectable writer has observed, "they seem to consider *established priests* as privateers, and *their church* as a kind of letter of marque vessel, allowed by authority to plunder a supposed enemy, and to make reprisals; but having no equitable constitutional claim on their property. The notion is certainly just;" but how far it may be prudent to act upon it, I will not take upon me to say. However, it is no way hostile to civil government, for these people are as good subjects to the civil authority as any of their countrymen.†

Lest the measures abovementioned should prove ineffectual to answer the malicious and bloody purposes of Charles's prelates and priests, a number of *satirical and defamatory pamphlets* were written and circulated throughout the kingdom, in order to inflame as much as possible the minds of the people against the dissenters. Dr. *Simon Patrick*, afterwards *bishop of Ely*, was one the most active in this scandalous business. He attempted to prove from certain passages he had picked out of the writings of the nonconformists, that, that party was not entitled to a toleration. Dr. *Samuel Parker* too, who was afterwards promoted to the see of Oxford, was a person who greatly distinguished himself in this service. His productions were such as might be expected from a person of his character. He once *licenced* a most scandalous pamphlet (some indeed have thought that he was himself the *writer* of it) charging some *baptists* with the *murder* of a minister in New-England, of the name of *Baxter*. It was entitled *Mr. Baxter baptized in blood*, and the object of it was to exasperate the court and the nation in general against the
baptists

† See Robinson of Cambridge's *Plan of Lectures on the principles of Nonconformity*, Lecture XI.

baptists as a bloody sect, which ought to be devoted to destruction.* The fabricating of various pretended *plots* against the state, and laying them to the account of the dissenters, in order to render them odious in the eyes of their fellow subjects, was another method much in vogue at that time. Swarms of *informers and false witnesses*, with numerous parties of horse and foot *soldiers*, were then likewise employed in the cause of persecution, in order to facilitate the ruin of the dissenters, and give some colour to the barbarous proceedings of their enemies.

By these means, my Lord, the minds of the people were so greatly irritated, that they did not hesitate at times to commit the most savage and frantic actions. To disturb the religious assemblies of the nonconformists, insult their persons, and plunder their goods, were some of their most moderate deeds. In some instances they actually persecuted them beyond death; for their dead bodies have not only been denied interment in the common burying places, but even dug out of their graves, and drawn on sledges to their own gates, and there left unburied.†

*The falsehood and villany of this affair, were almost immediately detected, by Messrs. *Richard Martin*, and *Henry Mountfort*, two Merchants from Boston, who happened to be then in London; upon this, application was made to the Council-board, by whose order the following declaration was presently after published in the Gazette.—(viz.) “Whereas there is a Pamphlet lately published, entitled, *Mr. Baxter baptized in blood*, containing a horrible murder, committed by four *Anabaptists*, upon the person of Mr. *Josiah Baxter*, near Boston, in *New-England*: The whole matter having been enquired into, and examined at the Council-board, is found altogether false and fictitious.”

‘EDWARD WALKER,’

† The body of one *Robert Shalder*, a *Baptist*, of *Croft*, in *Lincolnshire*, was so treated in the year 1666.—He had suffered much

These, my Lord, were hard measures, and can surely do no credit to the memory of those *prelates*, by whose

much by imprisonment for conscience sake, and dying soon after his release from prison, was interred in the common burying ground, among his ancestors. The same day some of the inhabitants assembled, dug the body out of the grave, and treated it as above described: and all, as I understand, under the immediate patronage of the *Spiritual Court*. Some verses were written afterwards, and placed on his grave, entitled *The dead man's complaint*. A part of Shalder's Epitaph, was as follows,

"Sleep pious SHALDER sleep, in thy sequester'd grave,
Christ's faith thou well didst keep, maugre the fiercest wave
Which Satan's storms could raise against thy faith, and now
In vain he findeth ways, his malice still to shew.
Thy Saviour had no grave, but what a friend did lend;
Enough if the Servant have like favour at the end."

See Crosby, as before, vol. 2. p. 239.

LINCOLNSHIRE was greatly distinguished in the last age as the favourite region of bigotry and persecution: nor is it much less so at this present time. The *Eighteenth Century*, with all its boasted improvements in civilization, humanity, and liberality of sentiment, has been able to effect no very material change in the character of this county. 'Tis not long since a very worthy dissenting Minister not many miles from Long Sutton, was very violently persecuted by a wretch who bore the double character of a regular *Clergyman*, and a *Justice of the Peace*. A similar spirit was manifested still more recently towards another; at no very great distance from Tydd St. Giles, by the Rector of the Parish in which he lived; from whom, indeed, a very different behaviour might have been expected.

But in treating on this subject, the history of the village of H-ck-ng-t-n, and the name of B-nf-n, ought never to be forgotten. What I refer to, happened but a very little while ago. A number of serious and peaceable people; who usually met for divine worship at a *licensed* dwelling-house in that village, found it necessary one time, (a person then lying very ill in that house) to meet at a neighbouring dwelling. The parson of the parish, in consequence of this, commenced a furious prosecution against them upon the *conventicle Act*, and by the most artful, unjust and barbarous management, grievously harassed and distressed them.

This

whose management they had been adopted. Mr. Noble, I know, will be ready to tell us, that the dissenters of the last age were a pack of *enthusiasts*, unworthy of legal protection, and who deserved to be suppressed.—That they were all quite free from enthusiasm, I will not attempt to affirm: but I will venture to say, that if they really were enthusiasts, so also were the bishops and the clergy who persecuted them, and therefore were equally unentitled to a toleration:—Witness their dogmas respecting the spiritual jurisdiction of kings, and their not being amenable for their conduct at any earthly tribunals, or subject to the laws of society; and likewise the doctrine of *passive obedience* and *nonresistance*, which they deduced from those dogmas, and for which they so zealously contended. Certainly, my Lord, the men who held such tenets as these, must have been some of the wildest of *enthusiasts*—the most contemptible of *fanatics*.

I beg your Lordship's permission here to observe, that Charles the 2nd's persecuting bishops, appear to have been viler, and more barbarous wretches, than even the *Gardiners* and *Bonnors* of Mary's days. The latter (papists as they were) did not let the poor protestants who fell into their hands, remain long in prison; but took care to have them soon committed to the flames, and put out of their miseries: whereas the former, the *protestant* prelates, of the good king CHARLES (*that pattern of patience, piety, constancy in religion, and christian magnanimity; as bishop Ward once described him**) suffered the poor *dissenters* whom they persecuted, to starve and rot

This and the forementioned instances, with others that might be added, are sufficient proofs, that the persecuting spirit of the last age exists still, in no small degree, in the English Hierarchy.

* In his sermon *against resistance of lawful powers*, preached before the king.

rot in the most loathsome prisons and dungeons. The pains which were inflicted upon the nonconformists of the last age, were of the most lingering, and therefore of the most cruel nature; and they were put to death by inches: so that their case may be truly said to have been harder, and more deplorable, than that of their predecessors, who had suffered in the flames of *Smithfield*. Besides, my Lord, those who suffered death for conscience sake, in *Charles's* reign, were *above ten times the number* of those who had suffered in that of *Queen Mary*.

My Lord, the spirit of the Church of Rome, is certainly very detestable; but time was, when the Church of England itself discovered the very same spirit. Indeed I cannot now take it upon me to inform your Lordship, when it was that it discovered any other spirit; for I have that yet to learn. "It is usual (says one who is a very good judge in this case) to impute the [present] virtuous moderation of the *state*, to the episcopal church, and to account a dissent from such a mild church less necessary now than formerly. The truth is, what the church was at first, that it still continues. It retains the same articles, the same ceremonies, the same courts, officers, principles and canons, that it had all the time of its persecuting; and it refuses to repeal any of them. The *state* has restrained the operation of the ecclesiastical system on dissenters: but the system itself is the same. The *state tolerates*; but the *Church does not*."†

The *dissenters*, however my Lord, are very ready to distinguish between *persons* and *things*—between prelates and prelacy—between the members of a corrupt church, and that church itself: in short, they are

† See Robinson's preface to his plan of Lectures, p. iv.

are very sensible, that there are in the church of England many worthy members; and they think it incumbent upon them to treat such always with all due respect.

I now crave your Lordship's leave to conclude my observations on this subject, in the words of the writer last quoted—It is a *part* of the plan of a lecture on *the state of religion* [in England] *from the Restoration to the Revolution*. “CHARLES II. (says he) was a polite, dissipated gentleman, of humane principles, but of no religion. When the nation restored him, they aimed to realize Oliver's plan of monarchy and liberty in Charles, whose inclination was good, and his title unexceptionable. Accordingly civil liberty was very much advanced in this reign; and so would religious liberty, had not the revival of episcopacy defeated the design. But those old sinners Episcopalians, not become wise by affliction, fell to their former practices again. They soothed the king; and first deceived, and then destroyed the puritans.”

“CHARLES published a declaration for liberty of conscience, which the parliament would have enacted; but the prelates acted the farce of a conference at the Savoy, taxed the puritans with sham plots, rendered them suspected by the government, and by the basest arts, got the act of Uniformity passed, which ejected above 2000 ministers. Then followed the Conventicle act—the Oxford act—under all which CLARENDON [with] SHELDON, WARD, and other bishops, imprisoned and murdered 8000—Impoverished and ruined thousands of families; drove multitudes into Holland and America, and robbed them of twelve or fourteen millions of property. The king, and the parliament, often endeavoured to give them liberty, but their designs were frustrated

ted by the prelates, and the clergy; who preached the *divine* right of kings, bishops, and tythes, passive obedience and non-resistance, and invented new church holidays for the purpose of propagating their seditious doctrines, while they overwhelmed the nation with impiety and immorality,"*

The foregoing remarks, my Lord, could not well be avoided in a work that was intended as a *supplement* to your friend's publication. They were rendered in a manner indispensable by the very illiberal strain in which that work is written, and by the many unhandsome reflections upon the nonconformists of the last age, which are there to be met with. What has been already said, and what shall be hereafter advanced, will, it is hoped serve as a sufficient antidote against the poisonous effects of Mr. Noble's uncandid and intolerant allegations.

Mr. NOBLE in vol I. p. 172. speaking of the hardships which RICHARD CROMWELL underwent after the Restoration, tells us; "he had no reason to complain:" and yet he owns, that he assumed the supreme power with the general approbation of the people. The *three kingdoms*, he says, *professed their attachment to his government—proffered him their lives and fortunes* to support it, and declared that the *salvation of the nation depended upon his acceptance of the sovereignty*, &c. (178 and 180.) Nor is it pretended that he ever forfeited the public confidence: our author on the contrary affirms, that *he had not a single crime in his political capacity to answer for.* (185.) Surely, my Lord, one might think, that this man, whose character was so very fair, and who had suffered so much from the injustice and treachery of his country, had a very good, and a very great right to complain.

No
* Robinson's plan of Lectures—LECTURE X.

No, no, says our memorialist, he had no right at all to complain, "since HE and his father had so long made their sovereign live in exile, and *so poor as not to be able to keep a carriage.*" But where is the proof, my Lord, that *Richard Cromwell* had any hand in keeping Charles in exile? Had he refused accepting the protectorship at his father's death, *Fleetwood* or *Lambert*, or some one else, would certainly have accepted it; so that Charles would then have stood no manner of chance for the sovereignty. And when *Richard* did relinquish the protectorship, the throne was not offered to the exiled king; nor was there any great probability, at that time, that it ever should be offered to him. If therefore there were any crime in causing *Charles* to live in exile, no part of the guilt of it belonged to *Richard*; and it could not, of course, deprive him of his right to *complain* under his subsequent troubles.

My Lord, your friend seems to think that he has drawn a most deplorable picture of human wretchedness, when he has told us, that *Charles* while abroad was *so poor as not to be able to keep a carriage!* The severe persecution of poor *Vavasor Powel* he could mention without any apparent emotion of pity; nor does he seem to feel much for the distresses of *Richard Cromwell* at *Paris*; but when he relates the case of *Charles* in exile—*having no coach to ride in!* he appears to be deeply affected indeed—as if it had been the very ne plus ultra of earthly misery!

But, my Lord, if *Charles* could not always keep his Coach, while abroad, your friend should have remembered, that he had always a brace, at least, of *whores in keeping*; which he valued much more, and which stood him, I suppose, at no less expence: so that even he himself, after all, had not seemingly the greatest reason upon earth to complain of his hardships.

hardships. The attachment of this prince to his women of pleasure, was so strong, that he would have thought a crown scarce worth the wearing without them. "When he came to die (says a certain historian) though he took no notice of his queen, he gave the duke of York a strict charge to take care of his seraglio of whores." Yet, if we may believe his *prelates*, he was a prince of singular piety—He was also the supreme Head of the Church of England.

In the notes at the bottom of pages 193 and 298,* mention is made of a well known *Life of Oliver Cromwell, Lord Protector of the commonwealth of England, Scotland, and Ireland*, which Mr. Noble with no small share of confidence, ascribes to *bishop Gibson*—because his Lordship's family was *allied* to that of his highness; and especially, because *the correct Granger* has ascribed it to him. As to the *family alliance*, that, surely, is but a very awkward and shabby proof of the bishop's claim to the work: or, to speak more properly, it is no proof at all of it—He might as well have alledged that the work entitled, *An account of the European Settlements in America*, was written by *Dr. Franklin*—because he is a native of America, a member of the Congress, and has much interested himself in the American Revolution; though it is very well known, that that same work was written by *Edmund Burke, Esq*; a native of Ireland, and a member of the British Parliament. And even *Granger's opinion*, my Lord, will not establish this point, *decisive* as your friend deems it, and *correct* as he in general might be. *Granger* was certainly mistaken in that instance. Not a page of that book, I am very sure, was ever written by *bishop Gibson*. The real author of it, I will venture to affirm, was no other than the late Mr.

Ijaac

Isaac Kimber, who was also the author of several other publications of considerable merit. Unfortunately for him, he was *not* one of the *regular clergy*, or a member of the church of England, but a poor dissenting minister, of the *baptist* denomination; which might be one reason why Mr. Noble was unwilling to ascribe to him so judicious a performance. That he was the author of the work in question, appears from the testimony of his *Son*, the late *Mr. Edward Kimber*, who in his history of England, published a few years ago, in ten volumes octavo, frequently refers to that work, as written *by his father*. The same is also declared in the *Account of his Life*, prefixed to a volume of his sermons, published about the year 1756, which was not long after his death. An *abstract* of that account I beg leave here to lay before your Lordship.—“Mr. Isaac Kimber was born at Wantage in Berkshire, December 1. 1692, and received the rudiments of a learned education from one *Mr. Sloper*, who was at that time Master of a private Grammar School in Wantage. Mr. Sloper, it is said, was a very worthy man, an excellent tutor, and had several young persons under his care, who afterwards made a great figure in the learned world; among whom was Doctor Butler, the late worthy bishop of Durham, and author of the *Analogy between Natural and Revealed Religion*. Under Mr. Sloper our author made a considerable progress in the Greek and Latin languages, in which he was much assisted by *Mr. Jones*, Pastor of the Baptist Church at Wantage, who took a particular liking to him, and from whose conversation he received very considerable benefit.

Being naturally of a serious, sober, and virtuous disposition, he turned his thoughts to the ministry; and leaving Wantage, he went to London, to perfect himself in the languages under *Professor Ward*

of Gresham College; and in Academical exercises under the direction of *Mr. John Eames*. When he had qualified himself for the ministry, he was very particularly patronized by the Hon. *Joshua Collet, Esq*; late governor of Fort St. George in the East-Indies, to whose conversation, and that of his brother *Mr. Samuel Collet*, he owed in a great measure, his establishment in those generous sentiments of universal love and charity, that enmity to imposition and persecution in matters of conscience, which governed him through the remainder of his days.

At the age of *twenty-five*, before he had got any settlement in the world, he married; and not meeting with the encouragement he expected as a *Minister*, he very early engaged in the business of a *writer*; and *one of his first productions was THE LIFE OF OLIVER CROMWELL*, in octavo, printed for Brother-ton and Cox. Soon after, he was concerned with Messrs. Bailey, Hodges, and Ridpath, in compiling a *History of England*, in four volumes octavo; the *third* and *fourth* volumes of which were entirely his. A few years afterwards, he wrote the *Life of bishop Beveridge*, which is prefixed to the folio edition of his works, of which he was the editor.

In the year 1724, he was called in conjunction with *Mr. Samuel Acton*, to the pastoral charge of a congregation, at Namptwich in Cheshire: but that did not prove to him a happy situation. The untoward conduct of some of the principal persons of his congregation, soon rendered his circumstances there very uncomfortable, and obliged him to leave that place about the latter end of the year 1727.

Upon his return to London, he officiated as morning preacher, or assistant to *Dr. John Kinch*, in Old Artillery Lane, and occasionally at Pinner's Hall for *Dr. Hunt*; and was also engaged in correcting the

the press for Mr. John Darby, and others. At the same time he compiled a periodical Pamphlet, called the *Monthly Chronicle*, which subsisted from January 1728, to May 1732, and was then dropped. In the year 1740, he wrote *the reign of George II.* which is added to the last edition of Howell's *Medulla Hist. Angl.* and soon afterwards, an Abridgment of the History of England, in one large volume Octavo, (a very judicious Compendium) printed in 1745, for Mr. Thomas Cox; and of which there have been several editions since. In part of this period, he was likewise concerned with Mr. Drew of the Union Fire-Office, as his Assistant.—These various labours he supported with a quiet and even temper, though visited with a very sore affliction, in his Wife's being deprived of her reason, and continuing in that state as long as she lived, which was above twenty years after. As they had been a remarkable happy couple, this misfortune lay very heavy upon him; but never occasioned the least diminution or abatement in his love and attention to her: and even her death gave him the most poignant sorrow he ever felt, and in some measure, contributed to hasten his own.—During the remainder of his life, he was supported by his firm and faithful friend Mr. Charles Akers, an eminent printer in London. Mr. Kimber died in an apoplectic fit, about the beginning of the year 1755; leaving behind him a very amiable and respectable name.*

This biographical article, I hope, will not prove altogether unacceptable to your Lordship. It will, at least serve to correct one of the errors into which your

* A further account of him may be seen at the beginning of his volume of *Sermons* above-mentioned; and in his funeral Sermon, preached at Barbican, February 9, 1755, by Mr. Joseph Burroughs.—See also *Monthly Rev.* vol. 17. p. 448.

your friend had fallen, and appear, upon a candid and strict comparison, no less necessary and important than some of the articles that have been inserted in the Memoirs.

I shall now proceed to lay before your Lordship, a few thoughts upon those heavy charges which your friend has advanced against *Hannab Hewling*. That Lady, by our author's own account, bore a most amiable and exemplary character, previous to her marriage to Henry Cromwell, the younger, of Spinney Abbey. While she was *Hannab Hewling*, she was an honour to her sex: but no sooner did she become *the wife of Henry Cromwell*, than she also became, all at once, it seems, a very infamous woman. For this wonderful metamorphosis our profound memorialist has not thought proper to account: so that we must either leave it, as he has done, among the mysteries, or else judge of it in the best manner we can. In the first place, my Lord, I will beg leave to question the truth of it; and will even venture to affirm, that there appears no just reason to doubt, but that this same Lady bore through life an uniform and a respectable character.—“But she was an Enthusiast:” Not more so perhaps than Mr. Noble. His bare word is all the proof we have of her *enthusiasm*; and that, I am sure, will never amount to a demonstration. But was not her “supporting the dissenting interest,” a proof of her enthusiasm? No; it was rather a proof of her *virtue*. She professed herself *a dissenter*; and had she not exerted herself in the support of that cause, which she confessed to be the cause of God and Truth, she would have left room to suspect, and even to impeach her integrity. Then, she “set her mind against the established form,” and even “set herself openly against the establishment itself.” And so she well might;

might; that is another proof that she was a sincere, and a consistent nonconformist. "But she was a *Baptist*?" yes; but it will not follow, it is hoped, that she must therefore have been either a fool or a hypocrite. We are further informed, that she "turned out the clergyman that had been long resident in the family, and entertained in his stead an Anabaptist minister." Ah! my Lord, this was her damning sin—which many a priest, besides your friend, will be apt to pronounce unpardonable, either in this world or the next. I doubt not in the least, but it was this very offence that chiefly induced our memorialist to transmit her name to posterity as an object of detestation. *To posterity*, did I say! alas for him, his work, I fear, will never pass that way, any more than mine—It will rather,

"Perpendicularly sink into the silent cell

Where great King Arthur and his Nobles dwell:"

or, as another poet expresses it, it will be—LOST,

"In th' oblivious gulph, the chaos dark and deep,
Where the long toils of learned dunces sleep."

After all, my Lord, as this woman was herself a *Baptist*, where could be the evil, the folly, or the impropriety, of her choosing a *Baptist Minister*, to reside in her house, in preference to a clergyman of the established church? Surely, no man living except Mr. Noble, could ever have thought of impeaching her character on such an account as this.

My Lord, one charge more against this lady remains still to be considered—she is represented as so totally devoid of conjugal affection, that she actually squandered her husband's substance, with such rapid and unexampled prodigality, as obliged him, *soon after their marriage*, to part with the abbey of Spinney; which seems to have been the chief of his paternal inheritance. That he parted
with

Spinney Abbey, and his other possessions in the manor of Wicken, in the year after that of his marriage, seems to be true: but that this was owing to his wife's extravagance, is not at all probable. From the well known opulence of her family, there is sufficient reason to believe, that she must have brought her husband a very handsome fortune: and had she been, before marriage, the most thoughtless and prodigal of womankind, it is surely not very likely, that she should in the course of one single year, have dissipated most of her own, and her husband's property; which yet must really have been the case according to your friend's representation. But the supposition will appear still more, and even absolutely incredible, when it is remembered, that she had always, in the former part of her life, bore the most fair and amiable of characters.—The woman that had ever been distinguished as one of the best of children and of sisters, could scarcely fail of proving, likewise, one of the best of wives, and of mothers: For, that disposition, which made her so very amiable in the former points of light, might be expected to make her no less so in the latter. And there is no reason to suspect, but that this was really the case.

But how then shall we account for the fact, that Mr. Cromwell was obliged to sell his estate, the very next year after he married?—My Lord, we may very easily, and very reasonably account for it, upon the principle which your friend has laid down in p. 156. Agreeably to his declaration there, we may assert, that "*frugality* how necessary soever, was seldom or never adopted by any of the Cromwells, and was unknown to this Henry Cromwell." His estate, in all probability, was so encumbered at the time of his marriage, that his wife had it not in her power,

power, either by the fortune she brought him, (which cannot be thought inconsiderable) or by the most frugal management, to retrieve it. In short, unless it can be proved, that Mrs. Cromwell was as infamous in her connubial and maternal capacities, as she was respectable for her other relative virtues, it must be exceedingly ungenerous and cruel to impute to her the embarrassments and misfortunes of her husband and family.

Of *William Kyffin*, the grandfather of the fore-mentioned lady, our memorialist says—"he was probably a native of Wales, or descended from a family in that principality, where the name signifies a borderer; he was put apprentice to John Lilburn of combustible memory, who was a *brewer* in the city during the anarchy and confusion that the civil war produced; he warmly attached himself to the cause of the parlement, and distinguished himself as much by his dislike to the religious, as the civil establishment, setting himself up as a leader of, and a preacher amongst the Anabaptists; but contrary to the practice of most of that sect, he behaved with much moderation and decency."* In this passage, my Lord, as is but too common in the Memoirs, there is a great mixture of truth and falsehood. The word *Kyffin*, or rather *Cyffin*, in welsh, does not signify a borderer,—it only signifies a border, or *boundary*. Nor can it be true, that W. Kyffin had been an *apprentice* to Lilburne; of which the great difference of their ages must be a sufficient proof; for the former was the eldest of the two, by many years—I believe *twenty* at least. Equally unfounded, I think, is the assertion, that Lilburne was a *brewer* in the city during the civil war; at least

K

that

that was not the business he had been brought up to; which was that of a *wholesale clothier*. During a good part of the civil war he was *in the army*, and afterwards, for the most part, a *prisoner*; so that it does not seem very likely, that he should be at all a *brewer* during any part of that period.

That Kyffin behaved, as a baptist minister, *with much moderation and decency*, no one who knows his character will attempt to deny; but that that, was *contrary to the practice of most of his sect*, wants proof, and is, I must say, an absolute falsehood. The Baptists of the last century, undoubtedly, had their failings; but those failings were neither more numerous, nor yet more disgraceful, than those of other parties. They had been long galled by the grievous yoke of tyranny; and had always endured *greater hardships* than any other sect in this kingdom. Their former sufferings had taught them to value liberty; and made them solicitous to secure and establish it. If that solicitude sometimes irritated them too much, and hurried them too far, it cannot be any way marvellous, or conduce in any very great degree to their discredit—it had long before their time been an established maxim, as I have already observed, *That oppression maketh a wise man mad*. None however, of the sects of the last century understood the principles of liberty, and the doctrine of toleration better, or understood them earlier, than the Baptists; of which I could produce very ample proofs, if it were necessary. Upon the whole, then, my Lord, it is not to be wondered at, that these people should appear so remarkably active and zealous in the cause of freedom, as to induce men of a certain complexion to charge them with *turbulence*, and to assert, that their conduct far exceeded the proper bounds of *moderation and decency*. It may be here

here further observed, that the Baptists of the last age contended for liberty, not as an exclusive privilege, but as the common right of men; so that they were earnestly desirous, that all their fellow subjects should partake of it as well as themselves, and to an equal degree.

Our author, (p. 462.) quotes Mr. *Hewling Luson*, as saying, that he THINKS Kyffin *sometimes* gave vent to his piety, by *holding forth* among the Baptists. This, my Lord, must be rather an odd expression from a man who could not but KNOW, that this same Kyffin was really a stated minister among the Baptists for full *half a century*. But, perhaps, he thought that, rather a disgrace to his ancestor; and therefore wished to conceal it. He however adds, that he believes Mr. Kyffin *never meddled with politics*. But this Mr. Noble positively contradicts: and he tells us, by way of proof, that Kyffin “was intrusted by the parlement, in 1647, to be an *assessor of their taxes*, to be raised for Middlesex; and [that] he was at the head of those that *signed a profession of the faith* of anabaptism, in 1644, in behalf of his congregation; [that] during Oliver’s protectorate, he *wrote to those of that persuasion in Ireland, to request them to live peaceably, and submit to the civil magistrate*; and [that he] also *signed an apology* in behalf of himself and his brethren, of the same judgment, with a *protestation against Venner’s fifth monarchy plot, &c.*” Of all which, my Lord, this seems to be the plain english—“Kyffin was certainly guilty of meddling with politics—*because* he once happened to be appointed an *assessor of taxes*; and *because* he took it upon him, another time, to *sign a confession of his faith*; and, moreover, *because* he had the assurance during Oliver’s protectorate, to write to the Baptists of Ireland, to *exhort them*

them to live peaceably, and submit to the civil magistrate; and finally, because he proceeded so far, after Charles was restored, as even to sign an apology and a protestation expressive of his hearty abhorrence of Venner's insurrection!" In short, my Lord, it seems to be your friend's firm opinion, That a man cannot possibly be an assessor of taxes, or sign a confession of his faith, or exhort his fellow subjects to live peaceably, or enter his protest against riots and insurrections, without being, at the same time, to all intents and purposes, *a meddler with politics.* I am much mistaken, however, if what your friend calls *meddling with politics*, be not a very different thing from what Mr. Hewling Luson calls by that name.

As to William Kyffin, my Lord, he was certainly one of the most respectable men of his time. Thrice happy had it been for this nation, if all its bishops and priests had been such men as he was. Even Mr. Noble himself, in spite of all his unreasonable attachment to the hierarchy, is obliged to own that he was, indeed, upon the whole, a very worthy and amiable person. Nor can I believe, that he would have said any thing to the disadvantage of Kyffin, or yet of his grand-daughter Hannah Hewling, had it not been for the baneful and diabolical influence of the Demon of *Bigottry*,

"That purple Prelate, chosen to preside
Over the whole *Ignatian* Drove,
And all the Clergy-Tribes beside,
All but the sacred Few, that mix their zeal with Love."

At the bottom of the page last referred to, we meet with this very remarkable assertion—"In the last century the anabaptists were powerful and turbulent; at this time they are inconsiderable and peaceable." The charge of *turbulence*, repeatedly preferred

preferred by this writer against the Baptists of the last age, I have considered already, and, I hope sufficiently obviated. The above representation of the *modern* Baptists, seems likewise to demand some degree of notice. He allows them to be indeed a peaceable people, but appears unwilling, that that should be considered as any *virtue* in them; and he even intimates, that it ought rather to be ascribed to their *inconsiderableness* and *want of power*. The Baptists of the last century (he says) were *powerful*, whereas those of the present day are *inconsiderable*; by which, I suppose, he means, that the latter are far less numerous than the former; or, in other words, that the Baptists have very much decreased since the commencement of the present century. This, however, my Lord, is absolutely false. They have certainly not begun to decrease yet; nor is that any way likely to be their case very soon. For many years, they are very well known to have been greatly on the increase; and it is no less true, that they are at this time the most numerous body of Protestant Dissenters in this kingdom. It is judged, I believe, on very good grounds, that they were never, at any one period of the last age, near half so numerous in England and Wales as they are at present. And for my own part, I cannot but think, after having paid a pretty close attention to the subject, that their greatest number in the *seventeenth* century, did not exceed a *third part* of their present number. It does not appear that all their congregations in this country, ever amounted to two hundred in the last age, and it is certain that they amount now to between five and six hundred. It cannot therefore be true, that *the peaceable behaviour of the modern Baptists* is owing to their being fewer in number than their ancestors, as this
very

very illiberal writer has insinuated:—on the contrary, it may be very safely affirmed (for it is certainly the real truth) *that it is solely owing to THE PEACEABLE TENDENCY OF THEIR PRINCIPLES,*

* My Lord, it is reported that *Sir Joseph Jekyll* concluded his speech in favour of the Mortmain Act, with the following words: "It hath ever been a great unhappiness, that the Clergy of our established Church have been no better acquainted with the Religion, Laws, Government, and true History of their Country." My Lord, I have seen many of the productions of the established clergy, that abundantly verify the above observation: and among those productions, I am obliged to reckon *The Memoirs of the Protectoral House of Cromwell*. The instance just now considered, is itself a most flagrant proof of the author's gross ignorance of the history of this country, even in his own time. Surely, that man's historical accounts can demand but a very small degree of credit, who is capable of representing the most numerous body of protestant Dissenters now in the kingdom, and whose places of public worship amount to no less than *eight or nine hundred*, as become now quite inconsiderable, and dwindled away almost to nothing. This, however, is but one instance among a great multitude that are to be met with in his publication.

My Lord, the *archdeacon of St. Albans* in his late memorable controversy with Dr. Priestley, has exhibited a very curious specimen of the same kind of historical ignorance—"Dr. Priestley in his *History of the Corruptions of Christianity* had asserted, That the bulk of common Christians in the age following that of the apostles were Unitarians. From hence he argues that the first Christians were so; and in support of his inference urges this consideration: "That
great

great bodies of people are very slow in changing their opinions." The archdeacon, to invalidate the doctor's argument, denies the fact, and asserts, that great revolutions in the sentiments of bodies of men sometimes take place in a short space of time, as a proof of which he instances in the deviation of the Dissenters from their principles, which he affirms to be so general, that though not long since they were almost universally Calvinists, there is scarcely now "(except among the very dregs of Methodism) a person who would not think it an affront to be taken for a Calvinist."—Dr. Priestley in his reply tells the archdeacon that this representation of the dissenters is not true, and only discovers his ignorance of them. Though he allows that the cause of Calvinism among them has considerably declined, he maintains that the Calvinists are the majority still—a fact which scarce any body of men in the nation, except the established clergy, can be ignorant of.

In a case of this nature, one would think that Dr. Priestley might have been credited, and that the dispute would have proceeded no further. No such thing: The archdeacon's infallibility must not be given up,—He therefore renews the combat, and maintains his position, with a rudeness, and pertinaciousness peculiar to himself, and with arguments truly ridiculous. This imperious dignitary was at length, however, quite silenced, and forced out of the field, by *Mr. Samuel Palmer*, of Hackney, a very respectable Dissenting Minister, and a Calvinist.* What effect this check will have upon the archdeacon's future conduct, time only can discover.

Here I would beg your Lordship's permission, just to observe, that it is no uncommon thing with
the

* See Palmer's Letter to Dr. Horsley, entitled, *The Calvinism of the Protestant Dissenters asserted.*

the Clergy of the Church of England, to represent *the whole body* of Dissenters in this kingdom, in much the same way as Dr. Horsley has done the *Calvinists*, and as Mr. Noble has done the *Baptists*; that is to say, as a very *inconsiderable* party—a body of people reduced to so small a number, and become every way so exceedingly insignificant, as to be now scarcely worth notice: and yet, my Lord, it is pretty well known, that the places of public worship belonging to this same body of people at this time in England and Wales, amount to between *two and three thousand*: and, if I rightly recollect, the places of that description belonging to the Establishment itself, do not very much exceed *ten thousand*.

I shall now take my leave of your Lordship, hoping that I have said nothing in the foregoing pages that will incur any degree of your Lordship's displeasure. If my endeavours to correct the errors of your friend's performance, and to give a true state of the principal facts there misrepresented, should meet your Lordship's approbation, I shall deem myself extremely happy. But be the event what it may,

I have the honour to be,

My Lord, with all due respect,

Your Lordship's

most obedient and

most humble Servant,

LYNN,

WILLIAM RICHARDS.

Dec. 24. 1787.

ent
in
he
ts;
dy
e-
to
rd,
lic
his
en
Et,
ra-
u-
o-
a-
p's
ors
ue
ed,
I
he

S.